

232

W18

Walker

What Jesus read

Acc. No.

473775

De 10

Feb

232

W18

Keep Your Card in this Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for four weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on his card.

No books issued unless penalties are paid.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



PUBLIC LIBRARY

Kansas City, Mo.

Keep Your Card in this Pocket

KANSAS CITY MO PUBLIC LIBRARY



0 0001 0292353 9

WHAT JESUS READ

WHAT JESUS READ

HIS DEPENDENCE AND
INDEPENDENCE

BY THE

REV. THOMAS WALKER, D.D. (LOND.)

*Author of "The Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish
Teaching of his Age"*

NEW YORK

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

1925

(All rights reserved)

237.
V118

Printed in Great Britain

175-25

NOV 4 1975

TO
KITTY

PREFACE

THE purpose of this little book is to present in a handy form as clear an answer, as present knowledge will allow one to give, to *three questions about Jesus* which are constantly occurring nowadays to the inquiring minds among both Jews and Christians, namely, What had Jesus read? What did he owe to his ancestral religion? In what respects did he make departures from the best Judaism of his day? The answer to the first question will be found in Chapter I, in which an effort is made to fill in a gap in the life of Jesus by means of well-grounded suggestions with regard to the facilities for reading which were very probably afforded him by the larger synagogues at Capernaum. The second question is answered in Chapter II in a very careful résumé of the teaching of Judaism during his period, and is based largely on an earlier work of the author (*The Teaching of Jesus and the Jewish Teaching of his Age*). For all the quotations from literature and the references which are held to justify the very positive statements in that chapter the reader is referred with confidence to this earlier work. The third question is frankly faced in Chapter III, where the author again relies on his larger book.

It is hoped that this smaller work will be of service to *two classes of readers*; first, to such as

may desire to know the results of recent research, but who have no time or perhaps aptitude for plodding through hundreds of pages of closely arrayed evidence; and second, to such as may, after going through the evidence for themselves, desire to have the results by them for ready reference and disentangled from the necessary heap of references which a large pioneer work must necessarily contain.

The author humbly prays not only that his work may make Jesus better known, but also that it may serve in some small way to bring *the more liberally disposed of the Jewish church and the more liberally disposed of the Christian church* to see more clearly, where their point of contact with one another really lies, and where is their real point of departure from one another. Nothing but good can come from sincere efforts on both sides to define the position to one another; and as what each thinks of Jesus will probably be determinative, these three essays on Jesus are sent forth as a contribution to that clarification of the issue, which must precede ultimate reconciliation of ideals and of the means to their realisation.

FOREST GATE, LONDON.

1924.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	9
CHAPTER	
I. THE READING OF JESUS	13
II. THE DEPENDENCE OF JESUS	22
III. THE INDEPENDENCE OF JESUS	59
APPENDIX TO CHAPTER I	99
INDEX	123

WHAT JESUS READ

CHAPTER I

THE READING OF JESUS

THE *knowledge of books* may come to one either directly or indirectly. They may be known either through one's own reading of them, or through one's contact with people who had read them for themselves. It is possible even to live for so long in a circle of people within which certain books of outstanding importance have been read, that, without having ourselves read this literature, we may yet be quite capable of talking intelligently their ideas, and if we have at all a good memory, of learning some well-known—perhaps, ere this, stock—quotations from them. Similarly we may get into the habit of using very readily and correctly a great many of their characteristic phrases. Some of Jesus' very evident knowledge of literature can be accounted for in this way, and his own relation to the teaching of such literature may be held to be all the more direct, because he had learned of it by finding it deeply imbedded in the mind of some circle or circles of people with whom he was on terms of the closest intimacy. But since in the time of Jesus books were comparatively few in number, it is not unreasonable to presume, that,

if one or two or even more religious books, other than those which were regularly used in connection with the worship of the synagogue, came to his knowledge through some circle of devout people, he would not for long allow the treasured books to be out of his sight. The leisurely habits of the East and the comparatively few wants of the Eastern would also make it possible for him to have time at his disposal to ransack some of the chief repositories of religious books in Galilee, whether they were synagogues of greater wealth than his own local one at Nazareth, or the houses of some of his more well-to-do friends. In that way he may have got to know a whole literature of a kind which is now represented by a solitary survivor. The question then very naturally arises, What facilities were there for Jesus to read books? There seem to be here three possibilities: private ownership, ownership by a circle of people, and ownership by a synagogue.

Well-to-do people in the time of Jesus *would have some books* in their possession; and even people who were not so favourably circumstanced, but who were inclined to reading, could be trusted in those days as in ours to make sacrifices to secure the treasures on which their hearts were set. Some of the early Ephesian converts seem to have had quite a stock of the wrong type of book. "Not a few of them that practised curious arts brought their books together, and burned them in the sight of all: and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver" (Acts xix. 19). The "man of Ethiopia, a eunuch of great authority under Caudace, queen of the Ethiopians,

who was over all her treasure, who had come to Jerusalem for to worship," was discovered by Philip on the highroad leading south, "sitting in his chariot, and . . . reading the prophet Isaiah" (Acts viii. 27 f.). Paul, too, is represented as writing to Timothy, "The cloke that I left at Troas with Carpus, bring when thou comest, and the books, especially the parchments" (2 Tim. iv. 13). We may assume, however, that books—in roll form as they were and written by hand—were not plentiful among the peasant or the artisan class to which Jesus belonged. But yet a devout home such as his was might have had a few treasures of its own.

The *common possession of books* was from a very early time *one of the marks of particular circles* of religious people within the Hebrew nation, and later within the Jewish church. Isaiah's method may be taken as typical of what often prevailed in later times. "Bind up the testimony, seal the teaching among my disciples" (Isa. viii. 16) is the divine order according to which he formed a circle of disciples round a written copy of his early sermons. "To the teaching and to the testimony!" (ver. 20), was the maxim which ruled in that Isaiah circle. In days when the third division of the Old Testament canon was still incomplete, or at any rate, not officially closed—especially in the freer religious atmosphere of Galilee—such religious circles with a particular type of book as their bond may not have been uncommon. Such a circle probably lay behind the formation by Jesus of the first circle of early disciples. As a member of one or more of these book-bound circles Jesus probably found one of his opportunities for reading.

Jesus' *fondness for the synagogue* meets us everywhere on the pages of the Gospels, and especially for that freer type of synagogue to be found in Galilee. It was the latter which gave him his first great opportunity of public service, and which tolerated him until he went even too far for them, or else they were pressed into opposition to him by the more conservative officials at Jerusalem. It is not at all likely that his own synagogue at Nazareth would be of very great service to him in this respect. We have probably to look elsewhere, especially to Capernaum and its larger and better equipped synagogues, for his special opportunities for reading. Early visits to the Capernaum synagogues may account for his first acquaintance with the fisherman families who figure so much in our Gospels; he may have stayed with them on the occasion of such visits. These visits, too, may throw a suggestive light on the way in which he was received by certain prominent people there, even approached by them from time to time that he might show them some favour or other. Besides, an entire stranger, who had not the rank of Rabbi, would not have been as readily given facilities for teaching as he was. If he had been a fairly regular visitor at these synagogues for the purpose of reading, very much is made clear that otherwise remains obscure. He would have his acquaintances there, and some devout people in those days may have been proud of the young artisan student whom they had seen, or heard of, using the rolls that were available.

It is really difficult to realise that *in the days of Jesus there was no Old Testament* in existence such

as we have—one book in which all the books were bound together was not then even possible. The fashion to have books in the form of leaves which were fastened together did not come in until two centuries or more later. The books of Jesus' time were all in the form of rolls varying from a few to twenty or thirty feet in length. They had a roller at each end, and the reader as he read the narrow columns wound up with one hand and unwound with the other. To be the possessor of an Old Testament would then mean the possession of a very considerable series of such rolls. But again, this Old Testament did not yet exist. All that existed was a more or less complete list of books which were separated from others in that they were regarded as sacred—a sacredness, however, which had not been clearly defined, but which rather registered more or less perfectly the preferences of the large majority of devout people. For five centuries the Law, the so-called Five Books of Moses, had headed this list of sacred rolls and were indeed in a class by themselves, as the very core of the Bible of Judaism. For over two centuries there had been a sacred list of Prophetic works, including not only books of prophetic sermons, but the prophetic edition of the nation's history, or rather a series of prophetic lessons in the history of their people. For some centuries another list had been forming, which was headed by the Psalms, Proverbs, and Job, but it had not yet been closed, and its exact contents—though in the main fixed by the time of Jesus—were not really settled until nearly a century later.

This means that *very few* indeed were in those

days the *enviable possessors of a complete set of rolls* covering the contents of our present Old Testament. Not every synagogue would be in that happy position. Some of the poorer synagogues, for example, in Galilee, may have had no more than the Law. Most would aspire to have a complete set of rolls to cover the second division of sacred writings, the Prophets. The Nazareth synagogue, which Jesus was accustomed to attend, was in possession of copies of these (Luke iv. 16 f.). Most synagogues, too, would aim at having in their reading-desk cupboards the Five Festival Rolls which were each read on a special or prescribed occasion. For the rest financial circumstances and local preferences would determine what each synagogue possessed. Regular Sunday lessons were taken from the Law and the Prophets only; but the books in the reading-desk cupboards were available for reading on other public occasions as desired, though not on prescribed occasions—except in the case of the Five Festival Rolls—and also for two or three persons who might agree to meet together for the purpose, or even for the use of a single individual who might be trusted by the authorities to meditate therein.

What *books were in any particular synagogue cupboard* in those days would be determined very considerably by regard for the type of people who attended that synagogue. At one synagogue Sirach might be preferred to Daniel; at another, Esther to either of these. There might be also in the cupboard or in the spare room, where old and disused copies of the Law were stored, some books such as were afterward definitely excluded from the

Canon. The synagogue was the best means of getting a book into circulation ; and books which were written in Hebrew had a better chance of acceptance there than others. That so many books continued to be written in what was then an unspoken language argues that the writers hoped to use the synagogue as a means of circulation. That the Semitic originals of such books quite suddenly and almost completely disappeared after Pharisaic opinion had been declared against them, also makes it probable that these were mostly at that time in the synagogues. There probably some of these were accessible to a devout reader in the time of Jesus. Those of them which were written in Hebrew and under the name of some man of ancient times were almost certainly intended to make their way, if possible, into the then still open list of specially sacred books.

In *the Jewish schools for boys* in the time of Jesus the basis of education was passages from the Law and the Prophets which were learned by heart by the scholars. The chief interest was in a knowledge of the sacred books. It would seem that any lad of parts, whose parents were not in a position to send him away to a Rabbinical school, might at any rate work his way to a knowledge of Hebrew such as would equip him for reading the sacred books in the original. Every synagogue would aspire to have a few such in the number of their regular worshippers. It was part of the early distinction of Jesus that in his own synagogue he was known to be quite capable of finding for himself the lesson in a sacred roll and of reading from it (Luke iv. 17)—his own translation or exposition

being given in the native Aramaic of his day. Very early, too, he showed a very extensive and a very intelligent acquaintance with religious literature and opinion, being quite capable of discussing with remarkable insight and ability the questions in which his contemporaries were interested (Luke ii. 46 f.).

If, then, his home and school life and his regular attendance at the services of the synagogue secured for him an acquaintance with the greater part of the Old Testament,—the Law and the Prophets,—his *use of facilities for private or semi-private reading* on other days than the Sabbath, which were afforded him by such synagogues as were *at Capernaum*, would be sufficient to give him a knowledge of the remainder of the sacred books,—those which were in the third division of the Hebrew Bible. On the evidence which is accumulating (see Appendix), it may be added that he became acquainted either through the synagogue library, or through the library of some private circle or circles, or through both of these, with types of literature such as are now represented by a few extra-canonical books which have fortunately survived the ravages of time. It follows, then, that we must think of Jesus as one who had been, before the time at which he emerges into public view in the Gospels, sufficiently interested in every shade of view and type of practice within the Judaism of his day as to have searched out for himself the writings which most faithfully represented these varieties. This full knowledge on his part, and the way in which he kept his own independence—now agreeing on this point with these, and then on that point with those, but never going over entirely to any one

sect, because to his mind each put emphasis on some matters which he regarded with disapproval, or at any rate which he could not regard, as they did, as essentials of religion and morality—contributed very largely to the impression that his message was something quite different from that of the professional scribes who were always the consistent exponents of the particular tenets of their own sect within Judaism (Matt. vii. 28 f.).

What was good in each he never hesitated to approve; what he considered was lacking in all it was his aspiration to supply. *A well-read working man of his time*, his own message was in no small measure due to the fact that he had first enriched his mind by a careful perusal of the work of all types of sincere seekers after the truth of God, such as his own people were able to present him with, not only in their officially sacred books, but also in the many other religious books and tracts which were circulating in his day. With fine discrimination he himself was accustomed to “search the writings” (John v. 39), and fully appreciated—with emphasis on the “every”—that “Every writing inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work” (2 Tim. iii. 16 f.). He, who himself attained to such a measureless inspiration, first recognised the varying degrees of divine inspiration in others, and was led on to his own matchless attainment by much that he had derived from these. He made his way through other men’s minds to a mind of his own on God and divine things.

CHAPTER II

THE DEPENDENCE OF JESUS

THE *indebtedness* of Jesus to *his own ancient church* it is very difficult to over-estimate. With the Old Testament in front of us, and the Jewish Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and, less directly, the Rabbinical literature now at our disposal, it is getting to be a comparatively easy matter to make the estimate with not inconsiderable accuracy. The fact that Jesus was for so long and so happily associated with the life and worship of the synagogue, and that he was for a period most welcome as a preacher within the synagogues—a fact to which our Gospel records amply testify—should make us presume that for a while, and very often, he urged upon his hearers just what a devout and earnest member of the synagogue might be expected to ask his fellow worshippers to believe and to practise. Born into a community which had as its natural inheritance a body of religious belief and a code of morality nobler than anything possessed up to then by any other community in the world, he was what he was to a very great extent because of that happy circumstance. Probably two thirds of what is recorded of his teaching could be very accurately described as just the excellent Judaism of his time given in all its fine purity by one who knew in his heart the clear well of the Torah, as many of his

contemporaries, we may presume, did not know it, especially such as had allowed the things of this life to shut out any serious thought of a life to come.

I. In his own church he had been taught from a youth upward to think of *God as another Somebody* who was distinct from and yet in very close relation to himself. He was from the first free from the vagaries of any form of pantheism whatsoever. The bias of his home religion was definitely against anything of that sort. From the first he had been made familiar with the idea that there was a higher will in relation to which his own will stood at all times. We can be sure that the titles for God which he used in the days of his youth were just such as every devout Jewish lad might have been expected to use. His use of "Most High," "the Name," "Heaven," "the Power," "the Holy," "the King" as well as "Father in heaven" can still be traced in his sayings as these have come down to us in the Gospels. Perhaps it was the idea of God as Sovereign of the Universe, that he was made most fully acquainted with, as a result of his worship at the synagogue. So at any rate the predominance of this title in the Jewish Prayer Book would lead one to suppose. "Father in heaven," where it is used therein, is not likely to have been an importation due to later and more or less unconscious Christian influences. The phrase itself is part of Jesus' Jewish inheritance; and yet it was not this phrase which held the determinative idea of God for his fellow Jews. "Sovereign of the Universe" had that honour. That this Sovereign of the Universe was "spirit" he had also learned from the beginning of his growth in knowledge and

discernment, though very likely the notion of "spirit" had not been as yet consistently elaborated for him by any teachers within his own or any other religious community.

It was also a great thing for him that he had been nurtured in the bosom of a people who from very early times had had faith to answer in the affirmative the question, "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" From the first *the justice of God* which distinguished with unerring accuracy between right and wrong and which guaranteed rewards for the righteous and punishments for the wicked, gave him the very notion of life that would make him quite naturally prefer a course of fine, clean morality to any other that the perversity of the sinners of his own people or of the Gentiles might present to him for his approval and adoption. By one's choices in such matters he was taught, and he himself was never tired of saying, one went to the right or to the left in the judgment of God. The precision with which this Divine justice would deal with the souls of men must have been one of the earliest religious lessons of his boyhood. In his parables with their fine sense of proportion in the matter of the requital of individuals and in some of his sayings in which he makes comparisons between the treatment which will be meted out to one class, and that which is to be meted out to another, there is abundant evidence of this. He shows himself aware of some of the problems which human suffering and especially cruel calamities had brought to men of his race who held that the justice of God was for them axiomatic. He even goes out of his way to reject some of the theories which had been spun

about the causes of certain classes of human suffering by such as felt that any explanation was better than any notion which might tend to undermine their confidence in God's justice. He may have cured not a few people, who were afflicted by a superstition concerning their sins to the point of bringing on themselves some infirmity, by inspiring them to give up the oppressive and oppressing notion of God's providence in respect to them. However that may have been, it was no small gain to him that he had been brought up among a people who had for centuries so tenaciously taught the justice of God that morality had flourished among them as it had not done elsewhere, and who had seriously wrestled with the problem of suffering.

His people, too, gave him an excellent start with the idea of *the love of God*. The kindness of God to his own people, and the tenderness of God's treatment of them would be illustrated for him from the lessons which were regularly read in his own synagogue. Whatever the type of literature of his people to which he might turn, the love of God to Israel would be sure to be impressed upon him. He would meet there also types of men of eminent piety toward whom, it was thought, God's love went forth in a very special degree or manner. This love of God was apt in the teaching of his people to be little more than an attitude of God's justice toward those who were righteous. This tendency, however, was completely overcome, as far as God's love to his own people was concerned. However much his teachers may have let the idea of God's love recede or be lost in that of God's justice, when they were thinking of the Gentiles, they must have often

expounded or emphasised the love of God to Israel as a love which persisted irrespective of the sometimes low moral condition of Israel during certain periods of her history. In that limited connection at any rate, very happily, he had learned of a love of God that would not let the sinner go.

From the earliest orthodox literature of his people he would be made familiar with *God as the Creator* of all in the natural world, and from more recent literature he would be made to think of the Almighty by Whose power would be secured a life beyond the grave. It was fortunate also for him that he was not brought up in a community where the deistic conception of God was popular. *The real Governor* in the affairs of the creatures of this world was *not an absentee Lord*. Deists, whose God is thought of as so remote from human experience that His intervention after the first creative act was not to be looked for, could never have reared him. He was taught that ours was a universe with God always and everywhere in it; that God used all the forces of nature for His purposes; that He was the most potent factor in the long history of Israel; and that it was His hand which also controlled Gentile history. The sin of man might make God in a sense inaccessible, just as He could be represented as being in more immediate contact with chosen men on particular occasions; this he could very well be taught and appreciate without coming to suppose, as he was never intended to suppose, that his devout contemporaries did not know God to be very near. Their simple and warm piety would have withered, if God to them had been thought of as One who was very far off from them.

The practical service of *the doctrine of angels*, which by his time had quite a prominent place in Judaism, was to bring God as near as possible to man and yet to keep Him spirit. The angel's presence was to all intents and purposes God's presence. God was never thought of as dwelling, as it were, on the farther side of the angel, remote from man. The angel was just the manifestation of God at a particular spot or in a series of clearly defined places. Jesus could never have been taught—by authorised teachers of his own people at any rate—the idea of gradations of being at the top of which stood God, and at the bottom of which stood man, with necessary intermediate beings between these extremes without whom God and man could never meet at all. Angels in the religious speech of his people suggested real operations of God. In fact, to them God on such occasions was just made angel, and dwelt among them, so making them realise very vividly the reality of God's presence with them. The angel presented God to the mind under the aspect of a special visitor on occasions of peculiar need or significance, but not with the implication that at other times He was in His relation to them actually a far-off deity. Besides, we cannot get away from the fact that Jesus' familiarity with his people's teaching on *the Wisdom of God* would very definitely and emphatically bring to his mind the idea of God as permanent resident, the inspirer of man's religious and moral nature, and the omnipresent spirit of God in human history.

In this connection, also, it should be remembered that it meant very much to him that the rise of the synagogue had for a long time given to *prayer* a

place of importance in the religious life of the people such as at one time it had not obtained. He would reap this advantage at every turn in his reading. It would matter little whether he was reading in canonical or extra-canonical literature, the witness to the reality of a life of prayer would be found to be persistent. Among the latter on this particular point he would find no difference between the more popular and the more learned type of book. No occasional introduction of intermediaries, we may presume, could ever have for him removed the impression which these witnesses give to God as a Being Who was directly accessible to the seeking mind everywhere. Jesus was cradled in the idea that God was attentive to the cry of the prayerful, whoever they be and wherever they might be, being moved to such attention, on the one hand, by a regard for justice to His creatures, and on the other, from a desire for their religious and moral purity. He had every opportunity of being trained to believe that God was seeking the production and would see to the vindication of morally worthy souls; and that He desired a community of such souls to be the willing instrument of His large purposes in this present world.

II. From a type of thought, now represented by some of the recorded sayings of the Rabbis, *the Kingdom of God* may have been in the time of Jesus a familiar phrase which simply denoted the Divine Government to which men should give obedience; but from another type of thought, now represented by some of the Apocryphal and Apocalyptic literature, it must have signified the establishment of a community in which there would be no sinners. Jesus

would be familiar both with the optimistic and the pessimistic views which were held with regard to the setting up of such a community in this present world. He would find himself presented with a choice between thinking of a kingdom which was to come before the final Judgment and which would be of limited duration upon the earth, and thinking of one which was thought of as coming after the final Judgment and which was therefore, wherever it might be located, more or less of the nature of a Hereafter. There can now be little doubt that he actually joined the optimistic majority among his people, in so far as he did not think that he had to wait for the final Judgment before anything could be done to improve matters; in some sense he accepted a belief in the coming of God's kingdom in the present world prior to that great settling up of accounts.

He would be familiar, too, with the optimists' thought, that that Kingdom of God was *really open to the Gentiles*. The less optimistic section of his people appear to have anticipated only a comparatively small incoming of Gentiles. Jesus would therefore find that devout people about him were divided roughly into two classes: some who sincerely shared the missionary outlook of the finest prophets of the Old Testament, and some who had all but lost that outlook altogether. It was something for him to find, however, that neither of these classes took any interest in the submission of the Gentiles with a view to the exploitation of them. In no case was it supposed that the superlative material blessings of the Kingdom were the outcome of exploitation. The subjection of the

Gentiles was either thought of with a view to their conversion, or else was just another name for their conversion. The best influences on the mind of Jesus would, therefore, be those of people who were too honestly religious and moral to regard the subjection of the Gentiles as a means of exploiting them for the material advantage of the Jews. On the other hand, the expectation was that the Gentile could only be fully admitted into membership of the Kingdom of God by submitting himself to the process of being made a Jew. After all, the Kingdom of God, even to the best Jews of Jesus' time was a *Jewish Kingdom* to which the Gentile was on certain terms admitted. This was a point in the thinking of his day to which he must have been compelled, before the opening of his public career one would think, to have given some thought, whether or not he had so early come to any decision with regard to it.

All his reading, too, would help to make clear to him the necessity for a development, far and wide and deep, of *the spirit of repentance* among the people. The teachers, who had not become thorough-going pessimists, and who therefore had not given up the present as so thoroughly bad that all they could do was to wait for God's direct interference to bring the course of events here to a catastrophic close, were agreed on the necessity for repentance in order to the creation by God of those conditions under which a godly community might be established on earth. He would be made to feel that a necessary human condition for the much-desired ushering in of the Kingdom of God was just such a national or world repentance as would result in a

return to real religious and moral earnestness in everything. This to him was an immense advantage. The people to whom he was indebted for his culture were not, on the whole, as oblivious to the processes of historical development as they are often supposed to have been, neither was the Divine interposition as mechanically conceived as it has been sometimes contended it was. The human and the divine contributions to the creation of the grand new situation, which was being anticipated, were held together in one system of thought about the future.

III. From the beginning he would be familiar with *the idea of a Messiah* who would be God's ambassador. He would be presented with a choice ; he might think of him as being in every respect human ; or he would be at liberty to suppose that he would be super-human. In either case he would be one who would do only the will of God who sent him. This Messiah would have to be one who would be pre-eminent in righteousness, and who was by this quality guaranteed capable of effecting only what a righteous God would have done. The very genius of his people would save Jesus from ever falling in love with the idea of a mere diplomatist ; it would rather inspire him to regard most highly him who would do justice not because it was expedient, but because it was of his very nature to do justly. He would be led to think of such a Messiah as one who would be so endowed with God's wisdom that he would prove himself capable of making his righteousness eminently effective among men. The Messiah was not to be just the pre-eminent example of unsuccessful righteousness. In him righteousness

was not to be any longer at a standstill, unable to do anything. He as the righteous one was to make headway. He was to have it in him to know how to get righteousness to work on the apparently desperate situation which was presenting itself to him. This was a great ideal with which to be met on the very threshold of his serious thinking.

There was, then, every opportunity for Jesus to become familiar with the idea of *the need for divine insight* into the proper application of righteousness; that action which was based on such divine insight makes righteousness powerful in human affairs, was a suggestion that nearly every possible branch of his reading would make to him in some way. What the scribe strove after in his treatment of the written Law, the wisdom he aspired to in his formulation of the oral Law or tradition, that very wisdom in all its sublime completeness, Jesus would easily be led to suppose, the Messiah should have. He would be educated in the idea that the Messiah should have the divine endowment necessary to making the principles of the Torah in their widest application workable in the new community. The wisdom of the Messiah would make righteousness, so long required by the Law and hitherto so much emphasised, an ordinary feature of the life of the children of the Kingdom. In the redeemed community the emphasis would be no longer on the Law, but on the mind of the Messiah who would fulfil the office of an ideal scribe, so wisely formulating righteousness that it could not possibly fail of its intention. This was a great idea for him to be brought up on.

Jesus would find too that *the human Messiah* was by far more popular than the superhuman Messiah.

This hope of a human saviour he would find very distinct, where particulars about the ancestry of the Messiah were ventured upon. He would find from his reading that contemporary events for the most part had determined the direction whence this saviour of God's people was expected to emerge ; also that, after the prevalence of other ideas in the meantime, the idea of the Messiah as the son of David had made its appearance again in his time as the once more popular conception. Further, he would learn that Judaism in his day had not as yet agreed in identifying any historical person with the human Messiah ; that while an occasional opinion had been put forward in the direction of so doing, none had secured general acceptance, and public opinion was against the idea that the Messiah had already come in any national celebrity. He probably found also that the mind of Judaism at the moment was rather more than hitherto occupied with the idea of the coming of the Messiah.

The first work of this Messiah, he would be educated to think, was of course to secure *political advantages*, such as would give adequate worldly supremacy to Israel. The suggestion would be placed before him with abundant emphasis that the Messiah, who was to be looked for, would have an active warrior-like part to play. God's king was not thought of as at once coming to reign in peace ; rather he had to clear the way that such a reign of peace might be possible. Jesus also had every opportunity of seeing in true perspective the place of force in the incoming of the kingdom. According to the best literature available for him, it was a regrettable necessity—something which had to be—

if the way was to be cleared for a reign in which force would not be needed to secure the doing of the righteous ruler's mind. He must have been fully aware also of the disposition in his day to suppose that the Messiah would come to put an end to the bad government of Rome; that he would come before the fall of Rome, and take an active part in securing the destruction of that great opposing world-empire. Humanly speaking, no other than this Messiah could prove equal, so it was thought, to so colossal a task. Only after the warrior Messiah had put to death his enemies would the peaceful, long looked for time begin. Even where the Messiah was not associated with such activity, Jesus would find that the necessity for this political clearance was yet maintained.

Consequently Jesus would be familiar with the notion that *the woes of the Kingdom's incoming* were mostly to be such as characterised stirring times in which political changes might happen. They were to be war and its accompaniments, together with sympathetic happenings in earth and sky such as would increase the terror of the times. The latter in this connection might suggest to his mind, poetically, that, since God existed, the permanence of existing bad government was only apparent, the power of God could and would work a revolution for His people. He must have known, too, that it was often thought that in the great war to come the people's own resistance would be backed up supernaturally. In connection with the expectation of political supremacy and security he would hear much made of the blessings of peace. His reading would constantly furnish him with pictures of a

community which should have freedom from the alarms of war, and have very real guarantee of security.

All the while he would never be allowed to lose sight of the idea that this political activity was only preliminary, a necessary clearing of the way for *the establishment of a righteous people*. This is where the best writers, with whom he would be familiar, after admitting or taking for granted the need for political action, really put the emphasis; and usually the righteous peace, when once it had been established, was not to be sustained by militarism on the part of the Messiah. There was to be a progressive removal of sin under the Messiah. His triumph was thought to be just such as a high-minded scribe-prophet might gain over his people, essentially the success of a fine powerfully subduing, and at the same time uplifting, personal influence; he was to be such that his word would then be gladly taken as law. The sonship of the Messiah in his relation to God was to be the influence that would secure in others a real moral and spiritual kinship with God, on the basis of which the community would be safe. Drastic changes under the Messiah were thought to be for the sake of the worship and the good life which the worship inspired; it was, then, a desire for something finer than mere possession of worldly power for its own sake by Israel. Again, we repeat, it was no small advantage to him to be brought up in a community where these conceptions were the common stock of the religious mind.

The idea of a *superhuman Messiah* was very much less familiar; but in the circle in which Jesus moved,

it does not seem to have been strange. This Messiah was held to be a real pre-existent being who, next to God, was of supreme significance. He begins his work after the resurrection of the dead, both righteous and wicked. The resources of the invisible world, it was thought, as they were arrayed against sin, and on the side of righteousness, were to become manifestly operative through him. His Messianic function of judgment was to be exercised not only in relation to men, but also as regards angels. Consequently this Messiah was distinct from God, and yet was so nearly God that he could act for God in the high capacity of judge of men and of angels at the last great Assize. He was the heavenly Doomster. The intervention of this Messiah was expected to bring judgment on the native rulers and the Sadducees at a time when their hand was against the godly section of the community to the point of shedding innocent blood. Jesus, also, must have known of the tendency to bring this Messiah into closer contact with the lot of God's people in the present world. He must, too, have recognised that—while never a very popular, nor yet, where known, a very stable figure in Jewish thought of the time—the idea of him facilitated the addition of supernatural features to the figure of the ordinary human Messiah. This God, or angelic Man, was to vindicate the persecuted and martyred pious, and then to dwell with them as the very power and presence of God in their midst, the source and centre of their glorified life. This was an idea with which he could hardly escape reckoning at some points in his experience.

IV. Jesus was brought up with the common-

sense idea of *man as soul and body*. This division he would find assumed in most of his reading, and especially in that part of it which lay outside of the books of the Old Testament. He would meet with the terms, spirit, and heart, and mind, used to present various aspects of the life of the soul which he was taught he possessed, and which was held to be of supreme value to God. His people were so far free from Greek influences that they consistently retained the idea of the body as the instrument of the soul which was for the time being resident within it. They might have recognised and taught him to consider the natural frailty of the human body, a frailty which was apt to be felt very much when it was being made the instrument of great sacrifice in this life, but he could never have got from them the impression that the body was a source from whence the pure soul within it was corrupted. He had learned from them, too, that the soul was that God-given personality which, once it had been given, lived through all the changes of this life, and survived even the experience of the death of the body. It was something to him to have inherited this fine Hebrew conception of the body, which forbade him to think of it as being in any sense essentially evil, the fount of sin, and to have been born in a period, when most of his people thought of human personality as surviving the experience of death.

He was also brought up with the idea of man as created in *the image of God*. By such teaching he would be led quite naturally to regard himself as belonging to the governing species on the earth. Man, he would be constrained to believe, was

destined to be a ruler like God, and, above all things, was under a perpetual obligation to be Godlike in the use which he made of his superior position. He would be taught that man had rationality sufficient for that position of rulership, and that he should aspire to have adequate moral insight for it. His reading would help him to keep the idea of might in closest association with and subordination to the idea of right. To the writers of his people this human rulership, if not exactly unthinkable apart from a revelation of moral capability, was not, without it, after God's likeness. Jesus was born among a people whose tendency was to see the Godlikeness in man's moral nature rather than in the mere circumstance of his being the ruling creature on the earth.

Nowhere else in ancient literature was the reality of *the light of conscience* so fully recognised, and the obligation to be true to that light so much insisted on as in the literature with which Jesus would be most familiar. He would thus be constantly made to feel that he should have a clearly conceived conception of his duty, and should assume in every situation his own moral freedom ; that it was his part to let the supremacy of his higher self be seen in a fine self-control, which at least should help him not to be carried away in his activities, or determined in his disposition, by the senses uncontrolled.

Alongside of this he must have known *the legends concerning the wicked angels* who by their contact with the women of our race were supposed to have been one of the sources of sin in human experience. He would be thoroughly familiar with the ideas and phraseology which resulted from the use of such

legends by some of his people. They would be to him a constant reminder of an actual or possible source of pollution to human personality. In his own recorded language, indeed, there remain some very slight traces of these influences. He would also be quite familiar with *the Adam and Eve legends* as affording him some explanation of physical death or else as suggesting a second or spiritual death which was to be experienced hereafter, and was the very antithesis of the God-intended blessed immortality. He showed himself to have been well-acquainted with stories of the first parents, and what the devil was supposed to have done for them. These peculiar legacies notwithstanding, the teaching of his people would leave him with the clear impression that he himself had not been seriously incapacitated for the attainment of righteousness by anything which may have happened in the past.

In this connection his literature would furnish him with *the doctrine of the Yetzer* or inclination. By it he would have set before him the idea that God has from the beginning placed in man an impulse or inclination, which was substantially an inability to remain for long morally neutral. This Yetzer had become an experience for evil by the will of man; but it could have quite another character. In fact, spiritual influences, good and bad, were thought to get to work on the mind of man through the Yetzer. This doctrine of his people would encourage him to very thorough introspection. It would suggest to him that the very foundation of his being was such that he could not remain a moral neutral. His will it was, he would learn, which

might determine that the basal impulse or inclination be in him a power for evil or a power for good. He would, therefore, be started in life with the reasonable hope that with care he might let the spirit of truth so indwell his Yetzer, that the spirits of deceit be kept out altogether, for by way of this basis of his personality the powers of darkness, he would be led to think, might make their approach to him, and so also the spirit of light. Yet, again, by teaching of this sort he would be warned that the effects of sin would be registered in the Yetzer so as to give a distinct bias to sin ; and from what he saw around him he might be led to suppose that such were the accumulated effects of past sin in the Yetzer that, only by a desperate effort on his part, or by a power not his own, or by co-operation with such a power, could he hope to be one of the few who could rise above the strong bias toward sin to a life of real righteousness. This teaching on an inward tendency was a very fortunate preparation for him ; he was not born into a people who had no interest in the real inwardness of religion and morality.

V. His ancestral religion with its fine sense of human obligation, Godward and manward, was given to him in *the Torah*. He had the prophetic books as the most valuable of its expositions. The fact that in his time the canon of Scripture, though in many respects already fixed, was not yet authoritatively defined and closed would encourage him to read rather more widely than otherwise he might have done. Besides, he had the further advantage of a body of oral tradition which had grown up around the names of certain Rabbis. He inherited

the ancestral joy in religion, as thus mediated, and had very naturally the greatest confidence in the permanent value of much of its teaching. He would clearly be made to understand that righteousness and holiness represented the essential ideas for which the Law stood, righteousness being its substance, and holiness being its form. Righteousness was the ethical aspect, holiness the ceremonial aspect, of the acceptable life. He would be trained to think that his people had been divinely chosen for righteousness, and that with a view thereto in this world a definite measure of separation was necessary. To him, then, holiness in practical life would signify the enclosure or method of enclosure, and righteousness that for which the enclosure was made or the method of enclosure adopted. Everything in his early training would tend to keep him from any intention of violently abrogating those customs of his own people, which had done so much to keep them unspotted from the world. We can be sure that any premeditated laxity in these matters did not commend itself to him.

Righteousness, he was taught, included justice, but justice by no means exhausted its content for those from whom he took his first lessons. His tutors had been profoundly influenced by the prophets of the Old Testament. This inestimable privilege of the guidance of a succession of prophetic men secured for him an idea of righteousness as something more than being rigidly just, and as more than something that might be on most occasions just very good policy. In his reading he would find long-suffering, patience or endurance, meekness, and even non-retaliation and non-resistance commended.

Equally imposing would be the presentation of mercy, love, and forgiveness, in the place of supremacy among the virtues. In some of his instructors the range within which such virtues were to be exercised might be somewhat limited, but in others he would find the old limitations crumbling, if, indeed, they had not yet utterly fallen away. His soul would be well prepared for the removal of all limitations. It was, too, a happy circumstance for him that his ancestral religion required an *inward, as well as an outward*, righteousness. The vices he found condemned would increase the impression on him of the inward requirements of the Law. Hypocrisy, pride, anger, hatred, were all condemned in the books which he read. He would then be fully furnished with the idea that a good man, according to the religion of his fathers, must be not only just and kind in his dealings with his fellows, but in mind humble and aspiring, loving and pure. He learned from this source, for example, the peril of the lovely woman, and the obligation to avoid the impure thought; the care to be taken of parents, and the reverence due to them; the danger arising from wealth as a possible substitute for God; and many other such things. From his mother's knee and onwards influences were constantly upon him to impress him with the necessity for purity of heart in order to find acceptance with God.

Central among religious observances he would find *the observance of the Sabbath*, not so much as a philanthropic institution, but rather as a love-token to God, an act done just because it met what his people believed was God's will, which on other grounds they knew to be just and generous. With

the world shut out as much as possible, they felt themselves more with God that day than on others. Amid the agreements and differences in the details of the observances, with which he would be abundantly furnished by his reading, he would be taught to observe the common motive, namely, that of so doing the will of God that day as to be farthest from the ordinary material concerns of human life ; it would be impressed on him, that for one day he should try fully to honour God by shutting the world out as completely as possible. He would know, too, of the essentially joyful character of the Sabbath, a feast among his people, never a fast ; a day upon which the sorrow of widowhood even was to be laid aside in the joy of the Lord ; one on which the shadow of death was never to be allowed to fall. Indeed, he would be fully instructed in the idea that the joy of the Lord reached its climax in the joy of the Sabbath rest away from the world and with God in a manner which it was believed was His will. It must have meant much to him that he was early taught that the joy of the Sabbath observance was the joy of doing the divine will.

Similarly, he would learn that *circumcision* was, according to the good pleasure of God, the token of his own life-long committal to the observance of the Law. From the same angle he would be taught to approach the observance of a distinction between *the clean and the unclean* ; it is the will of God, and God is good. All the rites associated therewith were not to be observed solely as means of separation from others ; much more he would find that to the devout mind of his period they had a value for their own sake as an expression of reverence for or love

to God. To keep the Law was wisdom, and the highest form of wisdom was the fear of God. At its highest everything was the outcome of respect for God. Such respect or reverence at its best was, too, a form of love, and with good reason in some of the books at his disposal it was so named. Everywhere there would be brought to his mind the fear or love of God whose will had been made known and character revealed in the Law. This regard for God was most intimately associated, in particular, with the ceremonialism of the religion which had been taught him. The test of sincerity or truth in this love of God was probably conformity in ritual matters. Not entirely so, of course, but in the sense that the love of man without this faithfulness in respect to religious observances would hardly have been considered convincing evidence of genuine respect for God.

Most of the writers Jesus knew probably thought that *the love of God* concentrated or focussed in *their ceremonial* was not something alone and apart,—rather just because it was so concentrated or focussed, it affected all the more powerfully and for good the atmosphere of ordinary human relationships. Yet he only understood these people aright, who kept in mind constantly, that this outcome, almost this by-product, in life and conduct did not exhaust for them the whole value and importance of their regard for God which their ceremonial so disinterestedly expressed. It must have impressed him that this ceremonial expression of love for God should have been thought to have had a value of its own, independently of any such effect; that its supreme value indeed should have been considered to lie in what it was over

and above any result in improved human relationship, so much so that the latter without it was thought to be altogether unsatisfactory. He would find, then, that the devout soul of his period could not feel, on the one hand, that all that was required of him was for him so to live that he would be put down as one who loved his fellow Jew or even his fellow-man, and, on the other hand, that he might possibly allow scrupulous care in regard to ceremonial regulations to exist alongside of neglect of the ordinary moralities without being aware of any inconsistency. This, notwithstanding, he would observe that, in view of the religious value which was assigned to the ceremonial, wherever there was any tendency to neglect, the humanitarianism would be sacrificed for the ceremonialism, and not *vice versa*. Love to God was made to come before and was held to be more important than love to man, and though he would find that the best usually would not permit any contrast as to their relative importance, wherever such contrast was forced on them, he would be impressed with the fact that the bent of mind was mostly in the direction of thinking more of the ritual in honour of God than of the kindness in relief of man. His contemporaries did not suppose that the kindness might be as good a token of love to God as the ritual ; that it might be a better token was almost unthinkable to them.

He would, then, find that *moral delinquencies and ritual offences* were both regarded as *sin*, and the latter more grievous than the former. The permanent effect of the prophetic activity on the writers of the works which were known to him in bringing to the front moral obligations would be a great gain to

him ; and yet he would still be made to feel that the stress was always apt to be put on the sinfulness of ritual offences, rather than on the sinfulness of moral delinquencies. He would be educated to go out into actual life with the idea that the ritual offences were more sin than the others. At any rate, when he came to face the problem of the removal of sin, he would find himself compelled to consider both kinds of sin.

His people taught him that there were certain *ceremonial rites* whose observance was intended to *take away sin*, in so far as sin took the form of offences against the holiness of God. Any unintentional lack of observance of the restrictions imposed, or any such failure to carry out a commandment, and also any contraction of impurity, so-called, were to be treated in this way. This was in his day the recognised purpose of some, at any rate, of the sacrifices and of the ablutions. They were performed in regard to sins which were first and foremost "impious deeds." It was a comparatively easy matter, then, to deal with sin from this point of view ; and yet since these sins against holiness were particularly sins against God, one can hardly exaggerate the seriousness with which the ceremonial freeing of oneself from any such sins by oblation or ablution was taken by his people. He would have brought home to him constantly the necessity for precision in the process of cleansing himself from sin of this sort.

With all this he could never get away from the demand for *repentance and reformation* which every kind of religious book of his people in some way made. Even in their treatment of the subject of

ceremonial sins, behind all the means to cleansing there was assumed to be in some degree a regret that one was unclean and the sincere intention to avoid being so in the future. Much more in regard to other sins he would find it assumed that a man should and could repent, and thereafter attain to righteousness which he had failed to reach when he was sinning. Here, too, of course, a repentant mind might express itself in gifts to the sanctuary, that is, to God, but a real reformation of life and conduct was the vital thing, the supreme, if not the only, *bona fide* proof of sincerity which made a person acceptable to God. Jesus would find, for example, that while insistence on sacrifices was continued, the best of his instructors were not deluded by any false doctrine of atonement. This call to repentance and reformation, he would find, was characteristic and representative of the best minds of his period. They would teach him that the object of the exercise of Divine mercy was the production of the repentant mind in men. There was a great deal in the Judaism of his day to make him take sin very seriously and to make him think that escape from it was of supreme importance.

From his people also he would learn that *the grace of God* helped the soul to repent and to reform, and that through prayer the Divine spirit of wisdom took up its abode and gained power in the human mind. Repentance which was directed Godward in prayer opened the door to the entrance of such regenerative influence. Everywhere in the books which he read he would have suggested to him the doctrine of the grace of God—the idea that the Divine power was helping men to be good. He was

taught that man had need of this helping grace, and that in response to prayer God would give the penitent soul the power to become good. Sacrifices and ceremonial washings of themselves, without repentance and reformation, he would be made to feel were of no avail. They were to be really the ritual of repentance and confession, and consequently the error of the formalist was to be avoided.

Repentance, prayer, fasting and almsgiving were very closely joined together in the practice of his people. The devout souls about him would make him feel that regular times of prayer should be practised, and probably would explain its efficacy in securing benefits to himself and others in accordance with a doctrine of work and merit, which was really the only doctrine of atonement they had. They thought that, when God had kept them long enough, or they had travailed sufficiently to merit, according to God's mercy—not in accordance with His strict justice—an answer, the answer came. The best minds of his time would lead him to suppose that fasting as a mark of intensity in one's good intention increased the merit and therefore hastened the Divine response; and that almsgiving had peculiar value as evidence that the prayerful frame of mind was not at all transitory, rather it was sufficiently sincere to affect conduct permanently for good. He would find, indeed, that the tendency was to make almsgiving the "righteousness" *par excellence*, and yet everywhere his reading would keep him from forgetting the necessity for the right spirit in all giving. The merit of the gift in the sight of God, it was held, was done away with, if an unworthy spirit were manifested. Consequently

the merit of a work was qualitatively, rather than quantitatively, determined. It was something to start life among a people the best of whom were quite clear in their own minds that it was the quality of the act which gave it merit in the sight of God.

Jesus had every opportunity of understanding that *works of the Law* were *not exterior deeds*, whose merit was determined without any consideration of the mind which was behind them. Only when a man felt himself right with God in his heart, he would be made to realise, was it any use his approaching God in intercessory prayer. Besides, *the doctrine of works*, which was taught him, was understood to be *in accordance with the mercy of God*. Works were not thought at any time to buy the mercy of God, but the presence of works in some measure made the situation hopeful enough to warrant God, who is just, in showing mercy to the suppliant. The doctrine was never set forth as an equation, x of works equalling y of mercy. Salvation was not strictly by works; salvation was by the mercy of God. The best souls of his time, of course, realised the tendency to think in equation style, but to their credit they resisted it, and in extreme fashion sometimes declared that salvation could not be strictly by merit. They made no secret of it that they would be more comfortable in their plea for mercy, when demerit did not outweigh merit hopelessly, than if it were otherwise; but even in that sad plight, with no merit to plead, there was open to the soul an unreserved appeal to the mercy of God. Even, too, where there was a sense of merit, it might be, so it was held, quite consistent with a consciousness

of ultimate demerit, and therefore in accord with sincere reliance on the grace and mercy of God. For them the mercy of God, not the equating of merit and demerit, was the fundamental matter. This trust in God was an essential constituent of the piety of the writers on whose works the soul of Jesus was nurtured. In conjunction with righteousness it brought to the front the right attitude of mind to God which was required under the Law ; and in association with works it denied that merit could ever be fully adequate to cancel sin. Hence, to rely on the mercy of God was in the end the only thing one could do. A man might rightfully feel that he had some things to his credit in the sight of God, but never to the point of forgetting what he still owed, and always must owe, to the mercy of God. His wealth of good works could never be such that there was no need to commit his soul, by faith, to a compassionate God.

VI. Jesus, also, was fortunate in being in touch with a culture which, as regards *the future life*, had whole-heartedly abandoned the vague Sheol conception which is usual in by far the greater part of the Old Testament. He was familiar with the idea that nearly always in the experience of the righteous, and mostly in that of the wicked as well, there was in the Hereafter a period of time which intervened between death and the final Judgment. In respect to this state, he would be taught that moral distinctions were observed, since there were three divisions in the place beyond death, one for the good, one for the bad, and one, apparently, for the indifferent. This last was a division reserved for those who had no longer joy or sorrow ; that is, the old shadowy

Sheol was thought to be reserved for those who were not so desperately wicked that they could not suffer all that they deserved to suffer before the end of the present life. But souls such as retain consciousness, that is, such as are hereafter capable of experiencing pleasure or pain—presumably the vast majority—he was taught, either had not been sufficiently rewarded in this life, or else had not been sufficiently punished. For these immediately after death there could only be either the rest of hope or the unrest of despair.

His reading would furnish him with the idea of a *preliminary paradise*, like some garden with springs of water, as the home for the present of those who, with the good angels in heaven, were classed as spirits of light. He would be instructed to think of these who were departed as possessing life and consciousness just as much as ever they did here. He would read of them as being still alive and active, and the term "sleep" which was sometimes used in reference to them, he would understand, was intended to convey the simple idea of rest and nothing more. It was taught that the individuality of each was preserved, since there was there a chamber for each soul. Great care, too, was taken by some writers to bring out the fact that they who go forth out of this life enter these chambers with even fuller knowledge than they ever had here. In particular, it was represented, that they entered the Beyond fully aware of the fight which they had had with sin, perfectly sure that sin was being punished, with clear knowledge of the fact that they themselves were approved of God, and in the experience of a fine joy which was but a foretaste

of a finer joy which was yet to be. They were held to be aware also that they themselves were beyond the painful struggle and limitation of mortal life, and that a larger angelic life awaited them, whose chief attraction for them was the vision of God which they would then enjoy. Moreover, in the chambers themselves it was thought that they knew of the flight of time.

Save that the spirits had no home and no rest, Jesus would find from his reading, that *the division of Sheol* which was *reserved for the wicked* who had not received their punishment in this life was thought to be in many respects like the division reserved for the righteous who await their full reward. The inhabitants were considered to be conscious and to have knowledge, a knowledge, however, which brought them agony. They had here an opportunity for reflection; reflection, indeed, was forced upon them. They were able to see that their wrong manner of life in the past had brought them to that point, where the wrong could not now be put right; that while others had a fine prospect of a reward, they had the horrid prospect of punishment ever staring them in the face; that while others had rest, they could have none; and worst of all, it was thought, that they were worn with fear of having to appear before God their Judge whose existence they had ignored during their pursuit of wickedness, and of whom they had said in their hearts that He was not. This is the wicked's experience of "darkness" preliminary to entrance into final punishment. This preliminary punishment which was due to anticipation of the real punishment to come was not usually referred to under the figure of "fire."

In the case of the fallen angels "darkness" was said to be experienced before, and "fire" after, the Judgment. The experience of wicked men was held to be parallel to, or the same as, that of the fallen angels. The immediate terror for the wicked at death was just that very "darkness."

His reading, too, would furnish him with very *definite doctrines of the resurrection*. He would find that some writers placed the resurrection at the close of a temporal Messianic Kingdom. There was to be then a resurrection of spirit, presumably from the intermediate paradise or chambers of souls. From that intermediate abode of rest, where they had been guarded by angels, they were to come forth into heaven. These spirits who had been preserved in being to the time of resurrection would at that moment enter into an angelic life. Jesus, therefore, would be from the first familiar with the conception of inheriting eternal life in the fine sense of entering into spiritual existence in heaven, a notion which was a stage in advance of another conception he would find in the course of his reading, namely, that of spiritual life on a new earth. In this Paradise as in the intermediate paradise there were many mansions. These writers thought of resurrection into the state of being superlatively happy spirits in heaven.

Jesus would find, however, that there were others who thought of the resurrection as preceding the establishment of the eternal Messianic Kingdom on earth. It was thought by these to be *a resurrection of the body* to be experienced by the righteous only. At the Judgment the spirits of the wicked who inhabited the darkness were not thought to be thus

re-embodied; they were simply transferred to where they had to experience their final retribution. Jesus would here become familiar with the materialistic idea of eternal life in a body much the same as the present body; also with the recognition that the bodies of those who survived to the coming of the Kingdom, and of those who were then revived for it, must undergo some transformation. This expected transformation, it was thought, would take place after the survivors had been joined by those who had been raised from the dead. That is, in these writers Jesus would find the idea of a resurrection of the body, though the body was in some sense changed to meet the new circumstances, either by being made so healthy as to be equal to a very long or eternal life, or by being transformed so completely as to be the fit organ of spiritual existence in a new earth. His main interest would be directed here toward the future life of the righteous, since at the final Judgment, so these writers taught, the wicked would be either without resurrection removed to the place of final punishment, or else after resurrection sent off the stage of desirable existence.

Some who either definitely gave up, or made nothing of, the Messianic Kingdom on earth, he would find, looked for the body to be raised as it was, and then *after recognition to be changed* into one possessing suitability for an enduring spiritual existence. This great change was expected by these to take place after the verdict of the final Judgment, and conceivably as an outcome of that verdict. These risen righteous entered thus the final Paradise or heaven. Such teachers started, then, with the resurrection of the old body, but

finally arrived at a view which is substantially that of those who held to a spiritual resurrection only. Few, if any, however, departed from the scheme of thought concerning the Hereafter which supposed that the order of events for the righteous after death was to be, rest in an intermediate state, resurrection for the Judgment, departure after the Judgment to the place of final reward, and for the wicked, unrest in an intermediate state, resurrection for the Judgment or judgment without resurrection, departure after the Judgment to the place of final punishment. The influence on the mind of Jesus of this general scheme of things that were to be in the Beyond can hardly be exaggerated. In this connection, also, he would be made familiar with the idea that God Himself or the Superhuman Messiah acting for God would conduct the Judgment, and that the Judgment which took into consideration both what men had done and what they had thought would be characterised by scrupulous accuracy. There was, therefore, everything in his religious environment to constrain him to take a serious view of human life and conduct.

For the most part Jesus would seem to have been taught that *death* marked the end of all opportunity to change morally, that a man's eternal destiny was fixed by what he did or became in this life. But yet while many of the writers with whom he was^{re} acquainted clearly had death in view as the point beyond which repentance could not take place, the possibility that others had their eye on a point further ahead but prior to^{re} the^{re} Judgment should be allowed for. Prayer and propitiation^{re} for^{re} the dead were not unknown among the Jews of his day, a fact

which indicates the beginning of a feeling among them that the consignment of souls to endless torments for their decisions and deeds here was hardly consistent with the idea of the justice of God, not to mention the idea of the tenderer side of God of which these writers were also aware, if indeed they had not made it so fully their own as they had the sterner side. This feeling gained ground, till prayers for the dead established themselves in the Jewish liturgy, and should be counted among the influences on the mind of Jesus. The same feeling he would discern in those writers who after the final Judgment allow the wicked to fall out of view altogether. Whether this signified a hint at the idea of the ultimate annihilation of the wicked, or was merely, from the point of view of the righteous, a case of out of sight out of mind, it must have been helpful to him to find that some of his people could not bear to have Gehenna always in sight, for them to see the wicked in their suffering. For some of his time the idea of Gehenna was ceasing to give them any pleasure of revenge; they retained the idea as a sad necessity of the moral government of the world.

He would be well acquainted with the pictures, which were supplied by well-known books, of *Gehenna*, the place of final doom for apostate Jews, to begin with, and then for the wicked in general. The gloom and bondage of the preliminary place of punishment were thought to be continued, and to these were to be added the fierce, all-consuming flame, signifying, perhaps from the first and certainly ere long, a really spiritual experience which was the very antithesis of the mystic experience of

God as fire which does not consume, that of meeting God as a consuming fire, and of not being able to get away from Him as such even for a single moment. No materialising of this conception by some could ever have hindered Jesus from a clear comprehension of its essence. This experience of the extreme penalty of sin, sometimes spoken of as a slaying of the spirit, could hardly signify immediate annihilation; it was a painful process, whether or not it ultimately brought extinction. If one may judge from the parallel of the case of the wicked angels, this punishment was thought to have great duration, and perhaps by some to be unending; and the place of punishment for the disobedient angels and the Gehenna prepared for unrighteous men seem to have been thought of as one and the same. It was a place to which one might well pray that oneself and one's friends might never come. Further, it seems unlikely that any writer with which Jesus was likely to be familiar ever thought that on the farther side of the Judgment a wicked soul was able to pass after a while out of this Hell into Heaven.

In view of this statement of the religious teaching on which the mind of Jesus was fed, most will see at once that *the claim of originality* which is made on behalf of Jesus must be made *with greater caution* than hitherto. Obviously, many of the things which have been claimed for him were native to the best Judaism of his day. This is a happy discovery, and, on the whole, should perhaps have been made sooner. It makes it much easier to account for the rise of Jesus. But yet it makes it very much more difficult to sustain some of the sweeping

contrasts between the teaching of Judaism and his teaching which have appeared often in very reputable works. This is not by any means to be deplored. If such sweeping contrasts were not true to fact, it is better to know this than to go on in ignorance repeating them. The first impression is, then, to the Jewish mind very gratifying ; but to the orthodox Christian mind it is very disappointing. The one rejoices, and rightly so, that Jesus after all is acknowledged to have been in so much just a very good Jew of his day ; the other is harassed with the suspicion that the outcome of investigation may be that there may be found little more in Jesus than could be found in good contemporary Judaism. At any rate, the religious atmosphere into which Jesus was born was the very best that the world of his day could supply for him ; indeed, it was the ozone of the best religious life of the period in which a soul might, if he would, become healthy and strong as a son of God.

CHAPTER III

THE INDEPENDENCE OF JESUS

THE *crucial question* now arises. As distinct from the most helpful religious and moral atmosphere into which he had the good fortune to be born, what was the mind of Jesus on the great topics on which a religious man of his time and of his church might be expected to form a judgment? In particular, what was it in his thought and activity which made him inevitably, so it seems, the point from which a new and most influential development in religion began?

I. The *paternal relation of God* to the human soul had become by the time of Jesus very much more widely and fully realised in Judaism than a reading of the Old Testament would lead one to suppose. Personal relationship to God had become very real to an ever increasing number of Jewish people from the time of the exile and onward. This is seen in the great seriousness with which the problem of suffering is faced by them, and also in the development of a very marked conviction in the minds of most of them that the inequalities of the present life would be balanced by the experiences which were awaiting righteous and unrighteous in the Beyond. God as Father, in the sense of His being the Source, the Creator of all things, had been familiar enough among them from very

remote times. He was also popularly thought of as Father, when His gracious protection of the particular community who honoured His name was in mind. That God cared for the individual as such was an idea in advance of any conceptions of His interest in the community; and it had been held by the devout of Jesus' people long before he made his appearance. Personal religion was very greatly stimulated by the services of the synagogue with their emphasis on the conception of God as One Who was accessible by prayer to the seeking soul everywhere. "Father in heaven" was, it seems, already part of its ritual.

Into this fine community, where prayer was encouraged, and where there was cherished an idea of God such as would tend to encourage regularity in prayer on the part of the individual, Jesus was privileged to come. In a sense he was its product; and yet he was more than its production. The idea of God as Sovereign of the Universe was foremost and determinative in the ritual of the synagogue then as now. The idea of *God as Father in heaven* was secondary in its prayers and not at all regulative of its thoughts. This was very early reversed in the mind of Jesus, and consequently in the minds of those who took their religion from him. Father in heaven in him and through him became the very centre of the conception of God, and Sovereign of the Universe henceforth served only to indicate the wide circumference of that divine Fatherhood. That reversal made a great difference. For the first time God became to a human soul the perfect Parent. Jesus grew up to the idea that he could

partake of the divine life, have that fine intimacy with God that a child has who grows up into sharing the life of his parent. The love of God meant for him love of each life as a separate somebody to be sought after and cared for. In his teaching he made God's love thoroughly personal, and also thoroughly universal. Religion thus became a sharing of the life of the Father in heaven to the degree in which a child shares the life of a parent, when he loves each unit of the family to which he belongs. There was full awareness that God was the Father of each soul, and that the family of God was not Jewish or Gentilish, but human simply and without any further differentiation.

This involved a *full appreciation of the spiritual idea* of God, an adequate recognition of the fact that God is spirit. This emerges particularly in his attitude toward the Temple. The hold of the Holy City and the Temple on his devout Jewish soul was great, and he frankly admits that he had temptation from that particular direction. The tempter's approach to him in his own affectionate regard for the Temple, he confessed, was at one time inclining him to give it an essential place in his teaching; but after deliberation he thrust the thought of so doing from him as a temptation of the devil. He resisted this tendency of his Jewish mind successfully. The hazardous venture, which he seemed to have been at first very much inclined to make, he ultimately realised would have been inconsistent with his own perfectly spiritual idea of God. He, therefore, refused to make this peculiarly Jewish institution an essential of religion,

as he had come to conceive it. He would not impose his own preferences on any. What had begun with Jews, he held, was not inevitably bound up with much which Jews held dear. Religion, as he appreciated it and as he taught it, might exist apart from the Temple and the Holy City; and since these were among the permanent religious institutions, which were always taken for granted as essentials of religion by all other prophets of Israel, Jesus' position in this respect was a deliberate advance on any position ever before taken up by the most spiritual of the teachers of his people.

II. He seems also to make a very definite advance on anything which had hitherto been taught among his people, when he makes *the experience of repentance* not so much bring one into a state of being saved as into a state of being filled with the saving spirit as regards others. To his mind the Kingdom of God on earth was not so much a company of saved as a band of saviours. In a word, he put the duty to be a missionary at the very heart of membership of the present Kingdom of God. Membership therein was not by him regarded as valid without full commitment to a life involving the utmost sacrificial service in winning others to the same commitment. To Jesus the Kingdom of God on earth was essentially a community of missionaries. The missionary spirit which he sought to engender was what he chiefly relied upon, humanly speaking. He thought of himself in his own sacrificial life and death as in a supreme sense exemplifying it, and he looked to the nucleus of the new society

to share in, and continue, his service and sacrifice, and so continually add to their number not only such as shall be saved, but also such as shall take their due share in the work of saving. He sought to create that missionary passion which would make one an untiring, ungrudging servant in the highest interests of others, never sparing oneself in order that others may be enthused with the same. This duty of conscious attempt at saving souls was a new departure which would tend to bring dissension rather than peace into families. He expected his disciples to surrender family ties and property in order to join a missionary community.

He riveted attention on the much neglected doctrine that only in terms of *service and sacrifice* would the worth of each to the Kingdom be estimated. He made service to be of the very essence of membership of it, and martyrdom to be the utmost form of duty. With this in mind, and assuming that the price would be paid, he very reasonably expected that his little, almost secret, society would soon make astounding progress and have an amazing influence. Not on apocalyptic possibilities, but on the possibilities of this society, in which every person was a servant and prepared to be so to the utmost in suffering, did he most rely. He was convinced that he had set things going, and that the rest was only a matter of time. This commitment of the individual to serious missionary propaganda was a very great advance on anything that had ever been known among his people. The missionary obligation is made paramount, and from the suffering which is entailed in fulfilment of the obligation none is

exempt. The Kingdom of God on earth is, in accordance with the seeking love of the Father in heaven which inspires it, of necessity a missionary society. Membership of the Kingdom is not valid if missionary obligation is not recognised.

The *growth of the Kingdom* on earth is the outcome of this missionary spirit, and that growth is itself essentially an adding to it of such as shall be missionaries. This was the very antithesis of the idea of people who folded their arms and waited for a divine interposition to destroy wrong, and reveals that there was in him the mind of the prophets rather than that of the apocalyptists. Little wonder that he expected so much to happen in a single generation,—the evangelisation of the comparatively small world that was in his day known to men,—when he was so constantly occupied with an idea of the Kingdom of God on earth which was so thoroughly and so profoundly missionary, that each member of it came to weep over his own sin and stayed to get inspiration to go out to suffer in the sacrificial service of removing the sin of others. The New Covenanters of Jesus were first penitents, and then second, and much more, suffering servants after the pattern of their head. The Kingdom here on earth was this sacrificial community, and the more it was itself the more it would grow. Its establishment by Jesus was, on his part, a great new venture of faith in God, the Father in heaven.

III. Jesus laid down, more clearly than ever before, that the only possible ground of such human communion with God as God Himself wills is *full committal* by the soul in all experiences

to *His Fatherly love*, a love which he conceived to be consistent with requiring from one this utmost sacrifice in the service which one was rendering for the salvation of others. For himself, even in the severest agony of his last experiences, there was no disturbance of his trust in this Fatherly love of God. His own appeals to others had for their inspiration his own fine experience of sonship. It was this son-spirit in him which gave an altogether new appeal to his prophecy; prophecy with him was just the straightforward appeal to men to enter into their privileges as sons of God. He was prophet become son, and as son he was the Father's prophet making appeal to his brothers to be reconciled to their Father, God. In form, his authority was such as a prophet claimed in speaking for God; in substance, it was such as came from his leadership in the experience of divine sonship. He led in this experience of divine sonship, and as prophet among men he relied on nothing else but the appeal which that sonship in him was capable of making.

In virtue of this great, even miraculous, leap forward in human experience of fellowship with God, Jesus, when consciously speaking to men out of the depths of this marvellous experience, was sometimes observed to be *using terms of himself* which, in the extant Jewish literature of the period, had been *used only of the wisdom of God*. He spoke then with the consciousness of being the very wisdom of God to men. He expressed his own self-consciousness in wisdom language. His mind in making its appeal to men dropped habitually into those very phrases that the great poets of

his people had used of Divine wisdom. Similarly and for the same deep reason he demanded a devotion to himself such as his people had not been accustomed to be required of them save to the recognised revelation of the Divine will. What he asked from them only the Law as the revealed will of God had required of them. It was an amazing procedure on his part for him to appropriate to himself what had been reserved for the Torah, that is, for religion as the great Lawgiver of his people had interpreted it to be. This egotism which our records agree in ascribing to him is best understood as the outcome of his clear and intense religious conviction with regard to the reality of his own experience of divine sonship. People were simply thunderstruck that he should put himself forward as an authority for them, as one who was capable of being the mouthpiece of a new Torah to men, as a person who was aware of himself as the medium of a higher wisdom of God than that which was contained in the recognised religious heritage of his people. It is not surprising that this seemed at first to some of his contemporaries not only astoundingly new, but an astoundingly new blasphemy.

Another side of this same thing in him is his *pre-eminence in righteousness as seeking, saving love*. He was the seeker of souls, the prophet who went after the individual, searching out the sinner, and who, instead of avoiding the bad companion, chose him as a friend with a view to accomplishing his moral recovery. This has been admitted to have been something quite new in the religious history of Israel. This idea of the recovery

of the sinner through pity and love and personal service was due to him. His own influence he designed to bring another chance to such as were seemingly beyond hope. His apologia of his friendship with the despised, unpatriotic taxgatherers and the like who were to the religious *élite* of his day incurable in sin, a moral and spiritual plague area to be shunned by such as would be healthy-souled, rested on his awareness of God's approval; nothing was clearer to him than that in his own saving activity he was loving as God would have him love. The passionateness of his interest in redemptive work reveals itself again in his fixed intention to make a vigorous prophetic appeal to the Jerusalemites. His determination also to carry through this very ministry of seeking love even unto death gave him more than anything else a sense of the approval of the Father in heaven. Nothing short of a sustentation of this seeking love to the very end, and amid the horror of premature and treacherously caused death, he thought, could keep intact for himself his fellowship with God in His saving intention.

For his mind, then, *the really significant suffering of God's servants* was not the suffering, which is so often accidental, such as wars almost inevitably bring to some people, but rather the voluntarily accepted agonies of martyr-men in their devotion to God as sons, he himself being chief of these. Not because of their fighting, but because of their suffering, would the Kingdom come. Jesus consistently held that the sword was to be kept out, and that the agony, in which he and his faithful followers would be involved, had some divine

necessity attached to it, being consistent with the finest revelation of God in the past, and with his own improved conception of the Father's will. In the place of the woes of a great war and its supernatural accompaniments, he put the suffering of himself and his disciples under persecution even unto death in the course of the divinest service to men in the present world. The new relationship with God, for which he stood, could not be established in the experience of others apart from the utmost sacrificial service on his part. He was convinced, however, that his own sacrifice in fellowship with, and in obedience to, God, would be the beginning of the same profound fellowship and obedience in others. Besides, he put fellowship with God for all entirely on the basis of sacrifice; that is, by his death he laid firm the foundation of the new religion of self-sacrifice.

For himself he could not get away from the conviction, distressing as it was to him, that *nothing short of his death would make his mission effective*. To his mind his death was just service of the Kingdom carried to the necessary uttermost, the tragic means of liberating men from that bondage which held them from living in accordance with the conception that greatness was entirely a matter of the quality and extent of the service which they might render. The necessity for the shedding of blood for the divine community's sake had already become a settled conviction with him, when he had an acknowledgment of himself as "the Anointed." Messiahship, as he conceived it, was consistent with martyrdom, though in and before his time it had not been

thought to be. It was for him a sonship which could only retain its validity in martyrdom, if martyrdom clearly were the form of devotion to the Father's will which alone would secure him leadership of others in the experience of sonship to God. Preparedness to be the martyr son *par excellence* seems to have been very early considered by him, and resolved upon with a sad suspicion that it might be necessary. Indeed, it would seem as if, in one who thought as intensely and as clearly as he did, his consciousness of sonship, and therefore of Messiahship, may have contained within it from the first the idea of the Suffering Servant. This would make his religious consciousness all the more original.

Further, he often drew a picture of the *experience of his disciples in exact parallelism to his own*. Preparedness to be martyr followers of him was clearly urged by him on their attention. That he so often drew a picture of the disciples' experience parallel to his own accords with the idea of the Old Testament prophet concerning a Suffering Servant community, which should be capable of accomplishing God's purposes among men. In Jesus, then, the warrior Messiah vanished in the martyr Messiah, and the members of the community who followed him consistently were to refuse the rôle of warrior, though it be at the price of accepting the rôle of martyr. Face to face with all the destructive forces of the powers of this world, his death was to be the norm of the new community's surrender to the will of the Father in heaven, since the at-one-ment with God which is discoverable in Jesus may, in truth, be said to

be his complete martyr devotion to the Kingdom of God. He expected that his example would show the way to others, would inspire them to the same method of at-one-ment with God,—and in the circumstances the only valid method, namely, suffering and death voluntarily undertaken out of obedience to the will of God, and from an unquenchable desire to be not less than of the utmost service to men. This was the new duty of death in obedience to the will of the Father in heaven and in order to secure the supreme service of men.

IV. In relation to the ancient Torah he manifested a very *wonderful freedom from the bondage of its letter*. Some of its provisions, as in the case of divorce, he brushed aside as concessions to human weakness, arrangements belonging to a less enlightened age, but no longer justifiable; others, as in his annulment of the *lex talionis*, he deliberately abolished,—he broke once and for all this fetter which bound men to a very faulty ideal of forgiveness between man and man. In so doing he very sincerely claimed that he was so accurately re-interpreting the spirit of the great legislator to his own day and generation, that he expected people who professed loyalty to the Mosaic Law to recognise the fine service to them which he was thus rendering. He intended what he had to say to be a natural development in reference to his own age of what Moses had laid down for a much earlier age. To him this practically came to mean that, while the nourishment of divine revelation and guidance was given in the time of Moses, that revelation was by no means final and of itself entirely sufficient for subsequent times.

To his mind the divine source of revelation which was behind Moses remained as a source still of *new revelation in his day*. God Himself was the perennial fount of new revelation for the new age. In particular, he was convinced that that new revelation was coming down from above through himself, so that he was in a very real sense identical with it. He was anxious in his teaching to be faithful to the spirit of the Torah and the Prophets, even if it resulted, as it did, in severe conflict with the time-honoured interpreters of the Torah, who were of course held in highest esteem by the people. Behind this combination of loyalty and freedom in respect to past revelation,—a loyalty and freedom which he encouraged in his followers,—there lay his inability to deny his own experience of a direct revelation from the Father in heaven. Such a claim was an altogether new thing within the Judaism of his period. Besides, he believed that the same Divine Presence who brought revelation to Moses would also bring it to his followers who chose to live in faithfulness to his outlook and spirit, and that in so following the new revelation there would be no real breach with the spirit of the old.

Consequently, there is evidence that Jesus had the feeling on occasions that he was *adding to the meaning of righteousness* as it was then understood. The good deeds of the devout person, he insisted, must be so good that they would shed real light into the minds of others by suggesting to them the thought of the Fatherhood of God. This, he held, could only be done by a seeking love on the devout man's part, such as was capable in extremity

of sustaining a prayerful interest in the souls of the spiteful. He must seek the development of a better mind in enemies who were at the time ostracising him, and pray for the growth of goodness in those paltry persecuting pests who delighted to pass him in the streets with their heads in the air, withholding from him the usual salutations. The righteousness which he demanded must be capable of sustaining a generous open-souled attitude toward such. The best Judaism of his day failed to be in this fine sense kind toward the ungrateful and the mean. It was sadly deficient in the most redeeming of virtues, the quality of mercy as that should reveal itself in positive efforts to save these. This deficiency in respect to love of enemies was radical, not accidental. The deficiency which Jesus saw even in the finest Pharisaism of his day was, that it might be allowed, that a man might become so much a prodigal that the obligation on one's part to take a loving, and often very expensive, interest in him as a brother need no longer continue. To his mind the ordinary business of being good should include,—indeed as things were, should very largely consist of,—a loving search for those who in their sin were very far away from their divine home. It was a new and very striking demand that the ideal of righteousness must have its climax in enthusiasm to seek out the sinner and to make him penitent. Fellowship with the Father in heaven in his seeking, saving love was for Jesus a very necessary mark of true righteousness.

Hence was it that the fact that *the taxgatherers and sinners* were regarded by the devout of his

day as unclean, and hence were people to be avoided, made no difference to his clearly conceived duty to get into touch with them, if by any means he might save them. This was a conscious effort on his part to make up for a radical deficiency in the best Judaism of his day. He himself deliberately went in for the generous-minded enterprise of being sociable with the worst with the hope of redeeming them, and he insisted that his disciples should do the same. It is his great distinction that he sought out the sinner, and commanded his followers to do likewise. To his mind goodness in men should be so brotherly in its complexion that through it a vision of the Fatherhood of God might reasonably be expected to come to other men. Their righteousness should be a seeking, saving love such as would minister to the sinner by making him penitent. Indeed, so extensive a work among the outsiders as is implied everywhere in the Gospels makes it not unlikely that, at some time during his public ministry, he spoke plainly to his followers about going forth to the peoples of the earth with a message in which there would be no subtle favouritism of one people, such as was always more or less present in the teaching and messages of their ancestral religion.

The virtues which, he urged, should be cultivated were very much the same as those which were put forward by the best teachers of his people. The originality of Jesus emerged, however, when *the range of the exercise of these virtues* was dealt with by him. The highest good of enemies must be sought in all sincerity. Forgiveness must be granted, until such time as there is no longer any

call on one's readiness to forgive. All class or racial limitation must be definitely removed from the familiar term "neighbour," so that henceforth it must mean without distinction any one who might be in need of one's pity, and help, and love. In his teaching "neighbour" clearly took on the meaning of brother; one's brotherly relation to any man was to remain unaltered under all circumstances, even those which came of his prodigality. Jesus commended a love which no limitation, no misunderstanding, no shortcoming, no treachery should stifle,—a missionary love which was ever bent on evoking the love of others. There is no evidence that such teaching in its wide range and fine intensity was commonplace under the Torah during his period.

In his desire for inwardness in religion and morality Jesus was entirely at one with the finest teachers of his period. But it is easy to see that *the nature of the inwardness* which was required by him was of a character superior to anything which was required by them. It is not in the fact but in the nature of the inwardness which is demanded that a contrast between them is clearly discernible. That the inwardness which he sought after was a deeper inwardness than they had in mind can scarcely be doubted, if it be true, as certainly follows from what has been already submitted here for consideration, that it meant sincerity in a love so profound that no limitation could be set to the good desire to help the needy and to save the sinner. It was the distinction of Jesus in the name of the Father in heaven to require and to be satisfied with nothing less than this sincerity

in a redemptive love which should know no let or hindrance. Sincerity in love had been required before, but scarcely sincerity in such love as this. Here he was very manifestly greater than his teachers.

Further, his propaganda in proclamation of the good news of the Kingdom of God was such that *the idea of proselytism was transcended*. Proof is not lacking that he really had in mind the coming of the Gentiles within the influence of the Kingdom. He seems to have looked forward to a sudden development of the Kingdom such as would attract to it the Greeks in whom he showed on one occasion at least a not inconsiderable interest. The gracious invitation was the same for all, an acceptance of the invitation was the only requirement,—the one condition that was applicable to all. Since to his mind the Fatherly purpose of God was determinative of the relationship of God to all men, there could not be in the invitation to enter the Kingdom, or within the Kingdom after entry, any subtle favouritism. The only possible qualification in order to be valid sons of the Kingdom of God, which he could admit, was that they be people who were showing themselves capable of, and actually growing toward, perfection as sons of their common Father in heaven. He rebuked the enthusiasm of some to make a proselyte having in view the usual notion in Palestine concerning the necessity for the Gentile convert to undergo circumcision. He could admit no such exclusive rights of the Jews in the Kingdom of God. To his mind the fact of one's being a Jew did not thereby qualify for membership of God's

Kingdom, and similarly one need not become a Jew in order to have a place within it. One had not to submit to having the birthmark of a particular nation put upon one in order to make sure of one's full status as a child of God.

On *the distinction between clean and unclean* there were many things Jesus said, which might have been said by any Jew who was in earnest about the service of God. But on some occasions he was understood to assert most emphatically that, if there was no moral defilement present in a person, it was out of place altogether to speak of defilement at all. In so saying he certainly stepped outside the limits of the Torah. It was shockingly new doctrine that only persons could be unclean or clean, and that their uncleanness or cleanness was not dependent upon the things which they made use of or which they chose to avoid. Not things in themselves, but only persons could be religiously the one or the other. This removed from the category of sins many acts which had been given great prominence therein by the devout minds of his time. In this bold way he gave a prophet's blow to an underlying principle of the Torah that certain objects or physical states were in themselves religiously unclean, and invited men to embrace a higher and purer conception of religion. His one and only enthusiasm here was that men put out and keep out of their lives the unclean spirit. By this test he judged himself, and his own success or failure in relation to men. In view of the fact that the ceremonial regulations, which his keen moral and religious intuitions made so altogether secondary that their neglect could not

be considered sin any longer, were esteemed by his orthodox contemporaries as special tokens of reverence for and love to God, it could not have been long before he was made to realise, if he may not have done so at first, the inevitable conflict between what he taught here and what was taught in the Torah and was supposed to be the belief of every member of the synagogue.

On the matter of *Sabbath observance* he was also from the point of view of current Judaism most startlingly original. He had no deliberate intention of annulling the Sabbath laws in general. His feeling and practice were mostly in accordance with the joyous reverence for God of which this day was expressive, and with the devotion of the day mainly to periods of meditation based on the Torah. But that he was often in severe opposition to those people in the synagogue, who stood for the letter of the Law in all its much elaborated rigidity in setting forth the ways and means of proper observance of the Sabbath, is clear from the trouble he sometimes took to show that a literal fulfilment of the Law could not be, and indeed was not, insisted on. In particular, the concession which had already been made for the sake of humanity, which allowed medical attendance on the Sabbath in the case of dangerous illness, Jesus pushed still further, till he made it that no case of sickness should be neglected, or left unattended to, on the Sabbath. He held that all ceremonial acts of reverence toward God,—very good in their place,—must give way before the demand for assistance which human need presented. Where the ceremonial observance of Sab-

bath stood in the way of a humanitarian observance of it, he laid it down that the latter must be continued, and the former discontinued to let it go on. He could not, then, plead guilty of irreverence toward God, though he did on the Sabbath. Rather he defended his healing work on that day as the only Godlike thing to do; he on his part could no more suspend for a day his task of working for human nature in all its great need of help which he could give, than could God the operation of His providence for a similar period. It came in his day's work for God among men; hence he went on with it, as naturally as did the farmer in his attention to his cattle on the Sabbath. His words, interpreted by his practice, meant more,—so it seems,—than his co-religionists could ever agree to. Even his friends on one occasion seem to have come to one of his meetings with the intention of taking him into custody as a mad and irresponsible Sabbath-breaker. To his mind there was no love-token to God enshrined in ceremonial exactitude in keeping Sabbath, which could take precedence of what was contained in the faithful continuance of the ministry of helpfulness to people in need throughout this most sacred day of the week. Sabbath observance, so he thought, could not be a love-token to God, if it was made to stand in the way of any service to man in need.

So in everything he definitely *subordinated the ceremonial expression* of reverence for God to the *humanitarian expression* of it. He did not in so many words do away with the former, neither did he say that it could or should have no place at all. He thought rather of the relative importance

of the one, when it was viewed in its relation to the other. If at any time one of these had to go, he declared that it must be the ceremonial, and he contended that he who under such circumstances let it go was not guilty of sin in the sight of the Father in heaven; the humanitarian, he laid it down, must never be neglected, for such neglect would be sin indeed. For him, therefore, the really serious sins of omission were concerned not with the service of God, so-called, but with the service of men; not with some etiquette, perhaps very good in itself, which was dictated from Temple or synagogue, but with some duty to others which was voiced by the spirit of humanity within,—humanitarianism here having not only or even chiefly in view physical relief, but all that is, in the largest and finest sense possible, truly human. Thus, in prophetic style he wrote down to lower than usual the value of ceremonialism as an expression of reverence for God, definitely removing it from the prior place which it had in current Judaism, and reducing it to nil, if it was unaccompanied, as opportunity was given, by the humanitarian expression. He held that he revered God most who most loved man. As one's reverence for God was to be filial, so it could best be expressed by being brotherly and saving in one's activity among men, unhindered therein by any ceremonial distinctions or class barriers. This was the necessary implication of his fine idea of the fear or love of God as filial respect for, and obedience to, the Father's will.

He went even further than those Rabbis did, who held that the moral laws were more important

than the ceremonial. To his mind there was *no offence against God* which was, strictly speaking, *of a ritual or ceremonial character*. This did not mean that ritual had no significance for him, or that he was committed to breaking away from, or to annulling, every such custom of his people. It did, however, signify that any good in these was to be found in their gracious effect on man, and not in their being outward forms of homage to God which were unconditionally prescribed for man as a being who was entirely subject to the divine will. What, therefore, were heinous sins to his contemporaries,—the wilful and deliberate transgressions of the ceremonial laws,—were not so to him. They were matters indifferent, in respect to which he displayed a conscious inner freedom which caused no small amazement on occasions even to his closest friends and admirers, and gave to others their chance for severe criticism and censure of him. By this violent separation of mere ritual offences from moral delinquencies, Jesus did the inestimable service of at once reducing the number of sins and clarifying the idea of sin by revealing its deep-seated root within the human soul. He cut away the whole class of sins, in relation to which sacrifices were offered, and so brought the entire system, which already, since the rise of the synagogue, had been greatly reduced in importance, to the point of vanishing away. He did what the most advanced of his day never did,—he definitely removed everything unintentional out of the class which he was prepared to call sinful. For him, only the intentional could be sinful, and then only if it was such as to affect

harmfully the whole character of the man,—never otherwise. Nothing that was unintentional could by any possibility be sin.

Having so done he required *a deeper kind of repentance* for sin than usual, a repentance not so much unto reformation, as unto regeneration. In his idea of it, repentance may have its start in regret for what one has done or been in the past, but it has its end in one doing or being what one has never done or been before. For Jesus, repentance did not so much bring one back again to what one had left, as drive one on to what one had not been hitherto. To his mind, the penitent was not a person simply prepared to go back to the regular practice of some old good deeds, but one who was ready to deny himself, to go on to an entirely new kind of life. It was repentance to become an entirely new type of personality,—the kind which had relation not so much to deeds as to a state of mind, and was to lead not so much to some improvements in conduct as to a radical change of soul. This entirely moral character which he gave to repentance was due to his profounder apprehension of God as Father; what God asked in the demand for repentance, Jesus insisted was that one should become God's child, should have a nature like God's. Sin was having the wrong, the unfilial nature; repentance should be such that it brought with it the right, the filial nature. He left the impression on his hearers that the type of soul, which he set before them in himself, was that toward which any true repentance should take them.

Consequently in his teaching there was a *greater*

emphasis than hitherto *on the grace of God*. That he should ever expect from men a repentance so radical arose out of his faith that the divine assistance was being afforded them. Prayer was just the human mode of ever more appropriating this ever waiting divine assistance. His ministry was essentially the good news of every man's opportunity of having his inclination so filled with divine spirit that its entire character was changed for the better. He himself claimed, with an astounding combination of enlightenment and sincerity, that he had always followed the good inclination, and he expected in his disciples the triumph of the good inclination, even as he had experienced it in himself. His own activity among men was expressly directed towards the encouragement of a following of the good inclination, as that had come to have in it, as its inspiring spirit, the spirit of sonship to God in the fullest sense of the term. That this was the opportunity of every man was the impression which he gave of life as he conceived it. His hope for man lay in the opportunity which he had of having his inclination completely changed from evil to good by the indwelling of God's spirit. Everything now just depended on the human will to receive. His only anxiety was concerning this receptivity ; so it was that he was accustomed to give men warning not to neglect their present power to receive. This conception of the holy Spirit had not hitherto been given this prominence in the intellectual life of the Jewish people. The nature of the divine help towards goodness and repentance had never been explained to them

before as the real presence of the divine Spirit within the soul itself. Jesus so far succeeded in directing attention to what the soul in becoming good thus owed to God, that those who were most ruled by his mind came to feel, that what they owed to their own power in the matter of their salvation was infinitesimal, in comparison with what they owed to the power of God working in them. He made clear, then, what does not seem to have been made quite clear before, that the divine spirit was constantly at work within every human soul helping the soul on through the experience of repentance to the goodness which was required. This gave a new recognition of the omnipresence of God in human experience. It made the omniscience of God to be more clearly related to human life than it ever had been before.

Hence, in the teaching of Jesus *the old idea of merit was practically done away with*. Jesus was never interested in a list of sins and their piecemeal cancellation, but rather in sin as a wrong direction of the human will and in the righting of that wrong bent of mind in the experience of repentance, which was really the triumph of the divine Spirit in the soul. Further, his attitude on certain outstanding features of orthodox practice depressed the idea, even if it did not crush it out altogether. He made nothing in the ordinary sense of the merit of the Sabbath. There is no reason to suppose that the much greater merit of circumcision was esteemed by him; what evidence there is points to the contrary. Sacrifice, a merit greater than that of the fathers, he left little or no place for, and as regards the latter he was

against the idea of reliance on the help or influence on destiny of imputed merits. Charity and loving kindness he certainly magnified, and it is, significantly enough, only in this connection that the idea of a store in heaven makes its appearance in the authentic records of his teaching. The merit of the Torah was minimised by his attitude of liberty toward the contents of the Law. The merit of the Tabernacle or Temple he seems to have very largely disregarded. There is no indication either that he confined his activities to Palestine because of his being obsessed with the great merit of dwelling in the Holy Land. The merit of repentance, as has been shown, was transformed by his making the objective of repentance not some measure of reformation in the details of one's life, but one's complete regeneration of mind by the successful operation of the divine spirit within one's soul. The merit of faith, it follows, was for him the constant sustentation of that receptive attitude toward the grace of God which had first been assumed in the experience of repentance.

The merit of those things which he most assumed,—namely, *charity, repentance, and faith*,—he connected primarily with the experience of the soul in the present life, and not with the making up of accounts at the last day. For him they had value as exercises which put the soul immediately in the most receptive attitude to the grace of God, which was operative everywhere and was seeking to bring the good *par excellence* into human life; and even when he spoke of recompense in eternity the recompense was of a

kind which simply meant that the work of grace in the soul which had begun here would have a significance in the Hereafter. But when the value of everything in life was interpreted, as it was habitually by Jesus, in relation to God as a present redeeming power for the soul, there was actually no room left for merit in the old sense of the term. Faith then was not trust in the mercy of God, since merit was deficient,—perhaps very greatly deficient,—but the regulation of a man's attitude to what he had been taught to regard as the revelation of God to the human soul. There was no outward constraint in the experience. It was just the spontaneous responsiveness of the human soul as a child of God to the declared will of the Father in heaven. Any trust in himself that Jesus required was of the nature of an assistance to trust in God ; and the trust of God, which he thought of constantly, was just the only fitting human response to the seeking love of God, which he conceived it his peculiar mission to make known to men.

The *only merit which he would allow* had any value in the sight of God was filial trust, the inward motive of filial obedience which must be behind all conduct acceptable to the Father in heaven. Thus, the hitherto more or less imperfectly ethicised idea of merit he thoroughly ethicised by making it equivalent to filial obedience,—an obedience which was through and through the constant response of faith to the love of the Father, and which was alone to his mind worthy the name of salvation. The only real merit in the sight of God was filial obedience, and to be filially obedient

was to be saved. This idea might be regarded as as evolution of Judaism, but it was such a reformation of its teaching that it marked a new beginning.

V. Again, for clarity of apprehension of *the justice of God* and dispassionateness in the exposition of it, Jesus would seem to have had no equal among the teachers of his people. The very intensity of desire in many of the writers which were known to him,—an intensity of desire amounting to an enthusiasm,—to see in human life the even-handed justice of God had in some measure hindered them from being accurate expositors of this their favourite topic. This intense and worthy desire for justice was sometimes in them in danger of becoming a low spirit of revenge. In the teaching of Jesus it fell into the background only in so far as the idea of God as King was fully subordinated to the idea of Him as Father, not that it was made negligible. At times he was at pains to show the precision of the Divine justice in its treatment of souls. He held that a man's trueness to his inspirations, be they few or many, small or great, was the test of what a man was. He was constantly warning such as did not think it worth while to put to good use the single occasional inspiration to goodness which might come to them. He emphasised, too, that those who did think it worth while might have varying success, and therefore, since the Father in heaven must see to it that ultimately it makes a difference to a man, if he choose to live one way rather than another, a reward varying in correspondence thereto. There does not seem to have been any among the writers of his people known to him in which this sense of

proportion in the justice of God had been so fully realised and so clearly expounded as it was by him.

Besides, throughout all this apprehension and exposition of the justice of God *the problem of suffering*, as it came up so often in the literature of his people, hardly appeared at all. He did not seem to need or to desire a theoretical solution of this perplexing problem for theistic belief. To his mind rewards and punishments belonged to a realm of experience to which pleasure and pain, prosperity and adversity, in the ordinary sense did not belong. He elevated the current doctrine of retribution by his perception of a higher law of compensation for human souls than anything so mundane. Though physical suffering was very real to him, so real that he sometimes felt the appeal of the temptation to shrink back from it, yet withal there was no problem for him on that plane of experience. The sameness of treatment which was so constantly accorded righteous and wicked in the natural realm did not for him bring any confusion of mind on the subject of the justice of God in human affairs. To think like God was to realise that life's gain or loss was not really a matter of so much common pleasure or pain. He had a clearer apprehension of the justice of God, and a finer vision of the exact region in which that justice with unerring precision held good, which resulted in the practical disappearance of the problem of suffering, as it was usually raised in connection with that justice. The problem of suffering and the justice of God never presented itself on his level of thought in respect to rewards and punishments. These could only refer to an

extension into eternity of the very kind of recompense, which even now is received from the Father according as the work of grace in the soul is helped on or hindered by human decisions. The place of apocalyptic in his teaching had to do, for one thing, with his belief that there was this sense and this realm in which the justice of God held good, was indeed perfectly exercised. It was his confession of faith that in a region above the natural the Father who would judge all men would do right.

As regards *the intermediate state*, there are some things in his recorded sayings which favour the idea that he had the third division of Sheol sometimes in mind, that division which was reserved, according to some writers, for those who were "men of the middle way," people who were neither righteous nor wicked, such as got their deserts in full in this life. If so, it would be most in accordance with his teaching, if he thought that this was a place where a man might start life again in the Beyond, having missed here the opportunity of gaining his soul or of making his soul his own. Such would be at the beginning of his accomplishments, when he might have been well on in the things of the soul. At any rate what he is recorded to have said to such should not be taken too readily as a threat of Gehenna, since he never seems to have uttered that threat except after deliberation which had resulted in a conviction concerning the very stubborn iniquity of the people against whom he uttered it. On the other hand, he gave a picture of the paradise section of Sheol which was much more home-like than any picture

of it which was to be found in any books which were known to him. This was the result of his filial conviction with regard to the Beyond, that for him and for such as were like him, death could not touch for the worse the communion with the Father which had begun here ; he could not think that death could ever alter that fact of experience, either for him or for his loyal followers, except to make it more real and more intense. In his words referring to the dark division of Sheol he gave at least one hint of disillusionment which death had brought to a man whom he had pictured to his hearers as having entered there. His imagery in this connection was perhaps to him more consciously figurative than it usually was to others. The darkness for him could only mean the experience of one who had discovered that he had by his unfilial conduct shut himself out from the light of the love of the Father in heaven.

Already in the literature of his people the cosmic significance of *the Judgment* was giving way to the individual significance of it. In the teaching of Jesus this movement of thought went forward to completion. Though the outward form of a great public Assize was still retained, it was not a Judgment of a class or nation or world that was emphasised, but that of the righteous or the wicked individual. Each individual was to receive judgment, and most significantly of all the standard of judgment was to vary in each case, and was to be in accordance with the ascertained opportunities of each. This latter marked an advance on current conceptions, since the Torah, it would seem, was usually regarded as a fixed standard for all, so

that by it men were almost automatically divided into good and bad, and also were accorded punishment according to their individual conformity to or divergence from its requirements. There was a tendency among his people to think of a judgment on deeds rather than on character. This, however, should not be pressed so much as it has been, for, after all, what was this weighing of deed against deed and even of thought against thought but a very human way of saying, that judgment to be just should not be made on an isolated deed, good or bad, but on the whole of such as revealing a man's real character. It is probably true that the teaching of Jesus tended to accentuate more than hitherto the character of a man as a whole, rather than the details of his conduct, but it is not safe to generalise, as one would be doing, if one were to say that this was in complete contrast even with the best religious thinking among his people.

The really original thing in the teaching of Jesus here was *the amazing flexibility of the standard* which he suggested would be set up, whereby it might not only be that present positions of people relative to each other might be reversed, but also that professed, and seemingly respectable members of the Kingdom of God on earth through their neglect of the practice of the spirit of humanity might be deemed unfit for membership of the heavenly community, and very ordinary people,—even pagans much their inferiors in religious culture,—who in what they had done had proved themselves faithful to such very elementary humanities as they knew, might be judged worthy of a place in the spiritual Kingdom in the Beyond, though they may

never have had any recognised place as members of the Kingdom of God on earth. A certain rigidity of standard characterised the best thinking of his day; hence the easily made divisions of people into good and bad. Jesus did not, of course, deny that there were such divisions, but he was certain that they were not as obvious as they were usually made out to be, nor was the line to be drawn exactly where it was popularly drawn by the ordinary religious mind of his people. He saw clearly that a rigid standard could not be just; that whether deeds or words or thoughts were in view, everyone must be judged relatively to the privileges, great or small, which had been enjoyed by him. He held that this must be the case, if the justice of the Judgment of God was to be worthy the name,—thoroughly Godlike. He predicted an astounding surprise at the Judgment both for certain popularly pious and for certain among the heathen, when, relative to the enlightenment of each, the justice of God settled everything by the degrees of the genuine rescue-spirit, which each had shown in the course of his activity among his follows. His finely original rescue-idea of duty in this way revolutionised for him the whole conception of the Judgment of God; and on the principle that what is in heaven must first be on earth, the Kingdom of Heaven on earth by this was revealed to have had only its centre in the professed missionary community,—within its wide circumference came all those who, in their own way in accordance with their light, gave a helping hand to another.

All his statements about *the risen life* are very

remarkably in terms of moral and spiritual life only. He looked forward to the time when the particular species of life, which was signified by eternal life and which he thought of as beginning here, would be lived under other conditions than those which this world afforded. To his mind the resurrection life did not differ essentially from the good life here, nor from life in the paradise which was to be entered immediately after death. Probably he presumed that as life in the intermediate paradise was an advance on life here on earth, so life in this heaven after the Judgment would be on that in the intermediate paradise,—for one thing those who were alive on earth would have joined those who had in the meantime suffered death. That he thought that life here would be followed hereafter by a happy intermediate state, which would issue in the resurrection life in heaven, might have been his way of saying that life in the Hereafter would be progressive, a passing from glory to glory. To his mind, then, the resurrection was the entrance into fullness of life in heaven, and was apparently of the nature of a happy advance in life for those who at death had entered a home-like Hereafter ; it signified progress in the life beyond.

If the idea of the Fatherhood of God, in the sense in which Jesus expounded it, were thoroughly worked out in relation to what happens after death and what ultimately was to be the fate of the wicked, it is difficult to believe that there would be left any place for *the notion of final doom*. This would not result from the thought that the Fatherhood of God made the forgiveness of sin

easy. The Fatherhood really would increase the difficulty of forgiveness, since it would make the condition of forgiveness at once clear and profound, simple but not so easy. The exclusion of the idea of final doom for the wicked would seem to be necessitated by that aspect of the Divine Fatherhood, which Jesus so singularly enunciated, and which was so manifestly the inspiration of his own saving activity. It would be a contradiction, indeed an annihilation of the Divine nature as he had revealed it to be, if there ever came a moment when the salvation of the sinner ceased to be an objective of the Divine life. God would be no longer the Divine Father, if there ever should fail in Him the love that would not let the sinner go. Jesus, therefore, never once said, as so many of the writers known to him had said, that there was for the wicked no place of repentance after death.

Whether or not Jesus had fully worked out his idea of *the Fatherhood of God in reference to the Beyond*, there can be little doubt as to what that full working out should be. There are some things in his recorded teaching which favour the idea that he was not as slow in this matter as the history of religious beliefs,—in its testimony to the manner in which a doctrine of the Beyond remains often for long unaffected by an advance in the doctrine of God,—would lead us to suppose that he might have been. In the light of that Fatherhood, the “many” stripes and the “few” of experience after death must mean that the stripes were not merely retributive. They must be the respective degrees of severity which the Father

needed to correct these souls. Jesus, as has already been observed, once gave a picture of punishment in the Beyond leading a soul to reflection, but at a stage apparently where punishment had not yet done its full work. What, too, he regarded as punishable in men was something which could be altered, for example, the unmerciful might learn that apart from Divine forgiveness his life would not be bearable, and hence the least he should have done was to have shown mercy on the comparatively few occasions which had presented him with opportunities for so doing. Jesus, moreover, asked for a faith, and hence himself had a hope, that in the providence of God there would be found adequate room both for the vindication of the righteous and for compassion on the wicked. These considerations favour the idea that he joined those of his people who thought that for some at any rate a measure of punishment before the day of Judgment might be sufficient to warrant their being at that time welcomed into Paradise.

Though there is no necessary inconsistency between *the Fatherhood of God and the Judgment of God*, consistency can only be sustained, if Judgment be not the last word of the Father on any. Jesus' outlook here was in harmony with those writers of his people in whom the gentler aspects of the divine nature had so wrought that they could not bear the sight of Gehenna and rejoice, and some of whom were making room in their devotions for prayer for the departed. He who had to the last a prayerful interest in the souls of those who most cruelly rejected him was just such as, had he been spared, would have worked out in

consistency with the Fatherhood of God his teaching with reference to their future in the Beyond. Even as that teaching stands, the total impression which is given of his mind favours the idea that the door of further opportunity was not fast barred against the wicked soul at death. This may have been what the time element which was involved in his acceptance of the idea an intermediate state meant. The "few" or "many" stripes might do their work,—the senseless man learn his folly, the rich man recognise his sin,—and the resurrection to condemnation be reserved for those only in whom perversity was of so extreme and radical a character that nothing less would suffice for them, the Judgment even then being the last and severest measure of redemptive love.

What is said of *Gehenna* in the teaching of Jesus accords well with this idea of the tendency of his thought. The amazing paucity of his references thereto is what most impresses one on turning from much of the literature, which must have been read by him, to the Gospels themselves. The only instance in the earliest Gospel looks in the very direction which has been anticipated in what has already been said here on the subject, and may be taken as a statement of the very view which has been advocated as necessary to bringing his teaching on the Beyond into consistency with his doctrine of the Father in heaven. The intention of the passage, which ends with a reference to being salted or preserved or saved by "fire," would seem to have been to say, that it were far better to exercise self-denial to the extreme than to be destined to have the rubbish of one's personality taken away as by

fire,—the personality being saved by this severe process. That this surgical self-denial in each instance was required, that sin against others be not committed, was in the style of the Rabbis who frequently insisted that certain sins,—for example, unchastity, adultery, mockery and anger,—would lead one to Gehenna. What distinguished his teaching from theirs was the implication that Gehenna was remedial as well as retributive in its intention; for the balance of the evidence is certainly on the side of an interpretation of his words, which, while allowing for the possibility that his teaching here was not systematically worked out in thorough consistency with his idea of the Fatherhood of God, yet sees such a softening of the harshness of current thinking on the subject as to make it likely that he had a feeling that those souls, who must meet God as a consuming fire, were only such as many stripes and dark reflection had not been equal to changing, and that such a fiery entrance of God into the experience of souls so perverse was just the desperate and regrettable expedient of a love in the heart of God, which could not let even the worst go beyond the range of His redemptive operations. This was going beyond what was assumed by some of his day,—namely, the operation of the grace and compassion of God in the darkness of the intermediate state,—in that it assumed also that even after, and perhaps through, the operation of the Judgment there were still in the infinitely resourceful love of the Father in heaven ways and means of winning back the last and most self-willed of the prodigals of humanity.

On these points it does not seem possible any longer to deny *the originality of the mind of Jesus*. In these respects he stepped out in advance of the mind of his time,—he left the teaching of the Judaism of his day behind him. There was nothing in his reading, however excellent, that took him so far. For the origin of these things in his teaching, which began a new movement in religion, one must turn to his own marvellously resourceful personality, morally and spiritually. Jew and Christian may offer their different explanations of this human phenomenon, and Christians may differ among themselves as to which is the only valid explanation, but all may unite in gratitude to him who so thoroughly worked out the idea of the Fatherhood of God that he laid on all the duty of filial obedience to God, the duty, that is, of saving men by personal sacrifices, to reverence for a human brotherhood both here and hereafter which should know no artificial distinctions such as the over-emphasis of national or class customs elevates to essential differences in worth to God,—a real human and divine brotherhood which should be based entirely and securely on each man's attainment of his own genuine sonship to God.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER I

Page 20

SOME illustrations of this accumulation of evidence may here be given. They are mostly of the nature of additions to those which have been previously noted by others.

Very many of the sayings of Jesus about riches seem to be echoing or improving on the words of *Sirach* (180-175 B.C.). "Happy is the rich man that is found blameless, and that hath not gone astray following mammon" (xxx. 8), is the only occurrence of the term "mammon" in extant Jewish literature, before its use by Jesus in "Ye cannot serve God and mammon" (Matt. vi. 24 || Luke xvi. 13). The Peshito version of *Sirach* gives two other instances of its use, but these do not appear in the Hebrew text of the book. In the following an important authority reads "camel" (κάμηλος) for "huckster" (κάπηλος): "Hardly shall the merchant keep himself from wrong-doing and a huckster will not be acquitted of sin. Many have sinned for the sake of gain, and he that seeketh to multiply (gain) turneth away his eye" (xxvi. 29-xxvii. 1). If the Talmud may be taken as guide, the more usual form of the proverb about something big going through a needle's eye referred to the great bulk of the elephant. If also "camel" was

a nickname for merchant, Jesus, whose thought and language on the occasion resembled the thought and the language of this Sirach passage,—compare, “How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God” (Mark x. 23),—very effectively substituted “camel” for “elephant” in “It is easier for a camel to go through a needle’s eye” (Mark x. 25 || Matt. xix. 23 f., Luke xviii. 24 f.), with a very obvious reference to the merchant class, and possibly with direct reference to this very passage in Sirach.

Some of the parables of Jesus may have been intended as homilies on passages from this book, which in his day was very nearly regarded by some as belonging to canonical Scripture. The parables of the Rich Fool, the First Seats at Feasts, the Persistent Widow, and the Rich Man and Lazarus have been noted in this connection. But in addition it should be observed that Sirach vii is devoted to man’s duties, including those to God and to His ministers, and that apart from the latter the following quotations form the headings, and may be taken as summaries of a man’s duties: “Hate not laborious work nor husbandry. . . . Hast thou cattle look (to them) thyself. . . . Hast thou a wife abhor her not” (vers. 15, 22, 26). In Jesus’ parable of the Great Feast these very duties in this very order are made the basis of excuses for neglecting the still higher duty of interest in God’s kingdom: “The first said unto him, I have bought a field, and I must needs go out and see it: I pray thee have me excused. And another said, I have bought five yoke of oxen, and I go to prove them; I pray thee have me excused. And another said,

I have married a wife, and therefore I cannot come" (Luke xiv. 18-20).

Again, a section in Sirach in praise of Elijah opens by describing him as "a prophet like fire, whose word was like a lamp (or 'torch') burning," and closes by stating that his work in the future is "to restore the tribes of Israel" (xlvi. 1, 10). Jesus' description of John the Baptist as "the lamp that burneth and shineth" (John v. 35) will readily occur to the reader, as also his remark on a later occasion, "Elijah indeed cometh first, and restoreth all things. . . . Elijah is come" (Mark ix. 12 f. || Matt. xvii. 11 f.).

The problem of the quotation or allusion in the following may also be simplified, perhaps solved, by reference to the words of Sirach: "If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water" (John vii. 37 f.). "Rivers" may be due to the influence of such a passage as the following on the Wisdom which was contained in the Law: "The Law . . . which filleth (men) with wisdom, like Pison, and like Tigris in the days of new (fruits); which overfloweth like Euphrates, with understanding, and as Jordan in the days of harvest; which poureth forth, as the Nile, instruction, and as Gihon in the days of vintage. . . . And as for me, I (was) as a stream, and my river became a (or 'reached to the') sea . . . yet again will I pour forth doctrine as prophecy" (xxiv. 23-33).

On the night of the betrayal the words of Sirach on the traitor-friend seem to have been in the mind of Jesus: "Every friend (*φίλος*) saith, I am

a friend ; but there is a friend who is (only) friend in name. Is there not a sorrow (λύπη) that cometh nigh unto death (ἕως θανάτου), a deeply loved friend (ἑταῖρος καὶ φίλος) who changeth to an enemy? O base nature! why then wast thou created, to fill the world's face with deceit! Base is the friend (ἑταῖρος) who hath regard to (one's) table, but in the time of stress standeth aloof" (xxxvii. 1-4),—compare also, "There is a friend that turneth to an enemy . . . a table friend. If evil overtake thee, he will turn against thee" (vi. 9 f., 12). "Friend" (φίλος = ܦܝܠ) in the opening lines of the passage is the warm word approximating in meaning to our use of "friend" in the sense of "lover"; toward the close of the passage "friend" (ἑταῖρος = ܐܬܝܪ) represents the cooler word, our use of the word "friend," as practically equivalent to "fellow." If the Greek is to be trusted as reflecting faithfully the Aramaic which was used by Jesus, then it was the latter word with which he addressed Judas in the garden, in the purposely and very significantly unfinished sentence,—perhaps left unfinished with a contemptuous movement of the hand: "Friend (ἑταῖρε), that for which thou art come"—(Matt. xxvi. 50). This use of the cooler word would have the force of "You traitor-friend!" if Jesus had previously, and of set purpose, been letting his language be coloured by this passage in Sirach on the friend who turns traitor. This seems to have been the case. In the upper room he refers to the unfaithful "table friend": "He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me" (Matt. xxvi. 23 || Mark xiv. 20, Luke xxii. 21). On entering

the garden he said, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful (περίλυπος) even unto death" (ἕως θανάτου) (Matt. xxvi. 38 || Mark xiv. 34),—this "sorrow that cometh nigh unto death," to quote Sirach, being his experience of "a deeply loved friend who changeth to an enemy."

The book of *Tobit* (before 170 B.C.) seems to have been a book which was pretty well known in the time of Jesus. A prominent character therein is Sarah, who "had been given to seven husbands, and Asmodæus the evil demon had slain them, before they had been with her as it is appointed by women" (iii. 7 f.). She laments, "Seven husbands of mine are dead already; and why should it be mine to live on?" (ver. 15). Concerning the proposed marriage with her, Tobias, the hero of the book, says, "I have heard that already the maid hath been given to seven men, and they have died in their bridal chambers" (vi. 14). Her eighth marriage is successful. Some members of the Sadducean sect once propounded the following to Jesus: "There were seven brethren; and the first took a wife and dying left no seed, and the second took her and died leaving no seed behind him; and the third likewise, and the seven left no seed. Last of all the woman died. In the resurrection whose wife shall she be of them? for the seven had her to wife" (Mark xii. 20-33 || Matt. xxii. 25-28, Luke xx. 29-33). Since the case was obviously imaginary, one may conjecture that it was just that of Sarah improved upon for the purpose in view; they quoted to him the case of Sarah as it would have been, supposing that her wish to die, after she had lost seven husbands, had been granted

to her. As the old father of the hero, Tobit, was represented as being very much concerned about the proper burial of any of his countrymen who were reported to him as having been murdered in the street, problems associated with the resurrection of the body may have arisen out of the main features of the story, before they were submitted in this form by these Sadducees. Jesus would, then, very readily recognise their adaptation of the popular story.

There is a striking likeness between how the writers of the *Second Book of Maccabees* (shortly before 106 B.C.) and the *Fourth Book of Maccabees* (63 B.C.-A.D. 38) suppose that supreme devotion may have to be expressed, and the manner in which the Gospels tell us that Jesus spoke on the same subject. "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me, and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me" (Matt. x. 37 || Luke xiv. 26), should be compared with the statement that "their anxiety about wives and children, as well as about brethren and kinsfolk, weighed less with them than their supreme anxiety about the consecrated sanctuary" (2 Macc. xv. 18), "For the Law ranks above affection for parents . . . and it overrides love for a wife . . . and it governs love for children . . . and it controls the claims of friendship" (4 Macc. ii. 10-12). "The sabbath was made for (διά) man, and not man for (διά) the sabbath" (Mark ii. 27), is also in the style of, "But the Lord did not choose the nation for the sake of (διά) the Place, he chose the Place for the sake of (διά) the nation" (2 Macc. v. 19, cf. John xi. 48).

Some of the sayings of Jesus seem to have been reminiscent of the very terms in which these books presented the case of the martyrs. The fifth martyr brother, it is said, "looked at the king and said, Holding authority among men, thou doest what thou wilt, poor mortal" (2 Macc. vii. 16). In similar terms Jesus made reference to the martyrdom of John the Baptist: "And they have also done unto him whatsoever they willed" (Mark ix. 13 || Matt. xvii. 12). The phrase, "to minister and to give his life (*ψυχὴν*) a ransom for many (*λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*)" (Mark x. 45 || Matt. xx. 28, cf. Luke xx. 27), is one which may have been suggested to the mind of Jesus by the following, "Make my blood their purification, and take my soul (*ψυχὴν*) to ransom their souls (*ἀντίψυχον*)" (4 Macc. vi. 29); the martyrs "having sanctified themselves for God's sake, . . . through them the enemy had no more power over our people, . . . and our country was purified, They having as it were become a ransom for our nation's sin" (4 Macc. xvii. 20 ff.),—"through them was their country purified" (4 Macc. i. 11, cf. 2 Macc. vii. 37 f.). It almost looks as if Jesus were deliberately elevating the ideas of ransom and of purification, which in these books were so closely associated with the ministry of martyrdom. Similarly, the beatitude, "Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. v. 10), is, from phrases which recur in the same source, to be ranked quite confidently among those of Jesus' sayings which had a Maccabean martyr reference; thus, "do ye die nobly for righteousness' sake" (4 Macc. vi. 23) is the exhortation therein to the

"sons of Abraham," and so on, line upon line, we read of "lives for the sake of righteousness" (ix. 6), "every form of death for the sake of the righteousness of our fathers" (ver. 29), "endurance for righteousness' sake" (ver. 31), "tortures in the cause of righteousness" (xi. 20), "for righteousness' sake . . . a sacrifice" (xiii. 12), "suffering for righteousness' sake multitudinous tortures even unto death" (xvii. 7), "torture for righteousness' sake" (xviii. 3).

There is no need to look for an unknown book of the Wisdom literature for the quotation, "I will send unto them prophets and apostles; and some of them they shall kill and persecute" (Luke xi. 49). "Prophets and apostles" in this Lukan version, and "prophets, wise men and scribes" in the Matthean parallel (xxiii. 24), may each be an Evangelist's paraphrase of the earlier term "witnesses" (cf. Acts i. 8). After restoring this term, as being the original of the two versions, it is easy to recognise the words as an intended quotation from the *Book of Jubilees* (109-105 B.C.). "And I will send witnesses unto them . . . but they . . . will slay the witnesses, and persecute those who seek the Law" (i. 12). In this book, also, Mastema is "the chief of the spirits (i.e. demons)" (x. 8), and in one place it is recorded that "the prince Mastema sent ravens and birds to devour the seed which was sown in the land" (xi. 11). Here surely is the literary influence behind the words of Jesus, that "straightway cometh Satan and taketh away the word which hath been sown in them" (Mark iv. 15 || Matt. xiii. 19, Luke vii. 12), which were given in explanation of the words in his parable,

“ And the birds came and devoured it ” (Mark iv. 4 || Matt. xiii. 4, Luke vii. 5). The picture of Abraham which is given by Jesus in, “ Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it and was glad ” (John viii. 56), characterised literature of this type. Here one reads, “ And Abraham fell on his face and rejoiced ” (xv. 17). In a very much later book the same idea is given more fully and must have been very much earlier than the book itself; concerning the heavenly Jerusalem God is represented as saying, “ And after these things I shewed it to My servant Abraham by night among the portions of the victims ” (2 Bar. iv. 4), and in an address to God there occur the words, “ Thou didst choose Thee one from among them whose name was Abraham; him Thou didst love, and unto him only didst Thou reveal the end of the times secretly by night ” (iii. 13 f.). Of uncircumcision the ultra-orthodox writer of Jubilees asserts that there is “ no more pardon or forgiveness . . . for all the sin of this eternal error ” (xv. 34). Jesus may have been having a side-thrust at that very idea, an idea which was doubtless much cherished by his opponents, when, in reference to their very manifest perversity, he made use of the phrases, “ never forgiveness . . . guilty of an eternal sin ” (Mark iii. 29 || Matt. xii. 32, Luke xii. 10).

The frequency with which the two great commandments,—the love of God and one’s neighbour,—are brought together in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (109–107 B.C., with later Jewish additions mostly 70–40 B.C.) is familiar enough, as is also the suggestion of the influence on Jesus of the great passage on forgiveness. With very good reason

some have heard in the words, which are put into the mouth of the Judge in the Judgment parable of Jesus, an echo of what Joseph in this book is made to say concerning his prison experiences in Egypt. There are other occasions, when it seems reasonable to suppose that Jesus had in his mind Joseph, as he is depicted in this book. Levi is here made to say, "Whosoever teaches noble things and does them, shall be enthroned with kings, as was also Joseph my brother" (T. L. xiii. 9). This was perhaps the very illustration in mind in the utterance of Jesus, "Whosoever shall do and teach them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. v. 19). So, again, Joseph tells what his practice was, when the Egyptian woman was tempting him, her attentions to him often being accompanied first with threats from her and then with punishment on his refusal of her solicitations: "I remembered the words of my father, and going into my chamber, I wept and prayed unto the Lord. And I fasted in those seven years, and I appeared to the Egyptians as one living delicately, for they that fast for God's sake receive beauty of face" (T. Jos. iii. 3 f.); and Jesus said, with Joseph as the popular illustration of what he was saying, "But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy inner chamber, and having shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret, and thy Father which seeth in secret shall recompense thee. . . . But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thy head, and wash thy face; that thou be not seen of men to fast, but of thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall recompense thee" (Matt. vi. 6, 17 f.). This is a very likely association,

since "the virtuous Joseph" (4 Macc. ii. 2) was a popular topic. One of the lost books is known to have been entitled, "The Prayer of Joseph," and, though itself late, it probably worked up a very much earlier idea of its hero. Compare, also, "And holding fast to the garments she falsely accused me . . . and when I was in bonds . . . I with glad voice rejoiced glorifying God" (T. Jos. viii. 4 f.), with, "And say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake, rejoice and be exceeding glad" (Matt. v. 11 f., cf. Luke vi. 23).

The following, also, may be considered as other evidence of his fondness for stories about Joseph. Benjamin says to his sons, "He that hath a pure mind in love, looketh not after a woman with a view to fornication; for he hath no defilement in his heart, because the Spirit of God resteth upon him" (T. B. viii. 2), and his elder brother himself in giving his experiences in such a matter, referring to the Egyptian temptress, says: "And often hath she sent unto me saying: 'Consent to fulfil my desire, and I will release thee from thy bonds, and I will free thee from darkness.' And not even in thought did I incline unto her" (T. Jos. ix. 1 f.). Jesus said, "Every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart" (Matt. v. 28). Joseph also says here, "And if any one seeketh to do evil unto you, do well unto him, and pray for him" (T. Jos. xviii. 2). Jesus said, "Do good to them that hate you . . . and pray for them that despitefully use you" (Luke vi. 27 f. || Matt. v. 44). Benjamin observes that "the pure mind, though encompassed by the defilements of earth, rather cleanseth (them)

and is not itself defiled " (T. B. viii. 3) ; Jesus urged on his disciples, " Perceive ye not, that whatsoever from without goeth into the man, it cannot defile him ; because it goeth not into his heart " (Mark vii. 18). Again Joseph recalls, " And I exalted not myself among them in arrogance because of my worldly power, but I was among them as one of the least " (T. Jos. xvii. 8) ; and similarly Jesus remarked, " he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger ; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. . . . I am in the midst of you as he that serveth " (Luke xxii. 26 f. || Mark x. 42 f., Matt. xx. 26 f.).

Judah here gives them to hope, " And after these things shall Abraham and Isaac and Jacob arise unto life, and I and my brethren shall be chiefs of the tribes of Israel " (T. Jud. xxv. 1). Zebulum expresses the same resurrection hope, as it applies to himself, " I shall rise again in the midst of you, as a ruler in the midst of his sons ; and I shall rejoice in the midst of my tribe " (T. Z. x. 2). Similarly Jesus assured his disciples, " Ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel " (Matt. xix. 28). Further, " There is no man that hath left . . . brethren, or sisters, or mother, or father, or children . . . for my sake, but he shall receive a hundredfold now in this time . . . brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children " (Mark x. 29 f. || Matt. xix. 29, Luke xviii. 29 f.), is akin to " Every one that knoweth the law of the Lord shall be honoured, and shall not be a stranger whithersoever he goeth. Yea, many friends shall he gain more than his parents " (T. L. xiii. 3 f.).

The indebtedness of Jesus to the *First Book of*

Enoch (containing different strata from before 170 B.C. till 94-79 B.C. or 70-64 B.C.), either through his own perusal of it or through its influence on the people to whom he owed his culture, is very obvious. The pictures of the Son of Man and the Judgment which are given by Jesus contain the very phrases and ideas that are supplied by and even reiterated in this book. Here, too, there appears in Jewish literature the first elaborate treatment of Gehenna as the place of final punishment, which must have formed the background for himself and his hearers of Jesus' direct and indirect references to the subject. These facts are familiar enough now.

The following, however, are worthy of closer attention and comparison, since they can hardly be independent. From *Enoch*, "And such a division has been made (for) the spirits of the righteous, in which there is a bright spring of water. And such a division has been made for sinners when they die and are buried in the earth and judgment has not been executed on them in their lifetime" (xxii. 9 f.). From Jesus, "And the rich man also died and was buried, . . . he lifted up his eyes . . . and seeth . . . afar off . . . Lazarus. . . . And he cried and said, . . . send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue" (Luke xvi. 22 ff.). The burial of the righteous in the *Enoch* passage is not mentioned, and likewise in the parable of Jesus there is no mention of the burial of Lazarus; whereas the burial of the sinners is expressly mentioned in the former, and correspondingly the burial of the rich man is distinctly referred to in the latter. Further, in our *Enoch* quotation the experience of the sinners "in their lifetime"

is clearly related to what they have yet to experience ; and in the parable the rich man is asked to " remember " that he in his " lifetime " had received his good things (ver. 25). Besides, the rich man's request for water may have reference to " the bright spring of water " in the Enoch picture ; there was water on Lazarus's side of the chasm, but not on his.

Once more, in chapter xc of this book " the birds of the heaven " (vers. 18 f.), namely, " the eagles, and vultures, and ravens, and kites " (ver. 16, cf. 13), are the Gentiles or, more precisely, the Greeks (see vers. 18 f., 30, 37). This seems to supply the reference which is required in order rightly to understand the parable of the mustard seed in the teaching of Jesus. " Less than all seeds " and " greater than all the herbs " (Mark iv. 31 f.), do not form the emphatic portion of the parable, since in Luke's shorter edition of it, there is no such emphasis. The constant element in the three versions of the parable is, " So that the birds of the heaven can lodge under the shadow thereof " (Mark iv. 32 || Matt. xiii. 32, Luke xiii. 19). It is tempting to suppose that this is not a merely unimportant embellishment, but is rather the main point of the parable, namely, the accommodation for these birds of prey, the room there was to be within the kingdom of heaven for these Greeks (cf. xc. 2), in some of whom he showed on one occasion at least a not inconsiderable interest (John xii. 20 ff.).

The language of this book on angels and angelic life seem also to have left its traces on the words of Jesus. Here the angels are said to be " holy,

spiritual, living the eternal life"; they have not "defiled" themselves "with the blood of women," nor "begotten (children) with the blood of flesh." They are "spiritual, living the eternal life, and immortal for all generations of the world." God has "not appointed wives" for them, "for as for the spiritual ones of the heaven, in heaven is their dwelling" (xv. 4, 6 f.). In a similar strain Jesus is found speaking: "Is it not for this cause that ye err, that ye know not the scriptures, nor the power of God? For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as angels in heaven" (Mark xii. 25 || Matt. xxii. 30, Luke xx. 34 ff.). Luke's version contains the words, "For neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels," which have their prototype also in this book, where the phrase, "exactly like the angels," is elucidated by, "to the intent that they should continue pure and righteous, and death, which destroys everything, could not have taken hold of them" (lxix. 11). From the sentences, "the face of (all) the angels in heaven shall be lighted up with joy" (li. 4), "ye shall have great joy as the angels of heaven" (civ. 4), the mind passes naturally to Jesus' expressions, "There shall be joy in heaven . . . there shall be joy in the presence of the angels of God" (Luke xv. 7, 10).

Similarly as regards the work of the angels at the Judgment, especially as it affects two distinct classes, the fallen angels and the sinners, this book says: "In those days the angels shall descend into the secret places and gather together into one place all those who brought down sin, and the Most

High will arise on that day of judgment to execute great judgment amongst sinners" (c. 4). Jesus, too, has the same twofold ministry of angels in view: "his angels shall gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them that do iniquity" (Matt. xiii. 41), since "all things that cause stumbling" looks back to "the enemy that sowed them is the devil" (ver. 39), and corresponds to "all those who brought down sin," the fallen angels in the Enoch passage, and, on the other hand, "them that do iniquity" is a reference to "the tares" who "are the sons of the evil one" (ver. 38), "sinners" to use the term in the Enoch passage.

The following, "And all the righteous and elect before Him shall shine as fiery lights" (xxxix. 7), "ye shall shine as the lights of heaven, ye shall shine and ye shall be seen, and the portals of heaven shall be opened to you" (civ. 2), "and I will bring forth in shining light those who have loved My holy name" (cviii. 12), give at any rate the natural contemporary context of such words of Jesus as, "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father" (Matt. xiii. 43). They would be understood as referring to the angel-like existence of the resurrected righteous. In this connection, too, "And they shall have been clothed with garments of glory. And these shall be the garments of life from the Lord of Spirits; and your garments shall not grow old, nor your glory pass away before the Lord of Spirits" (lxii. 15 f.), is interesting and illuminating in view of Jesus' parable of "a man who had not on a wedding garment" (Matt. xxii. 11). As some think

that Matt. xxii. 11-14 formed a portion of a parable of which the opening has been lost, the garment here referred to may have been made into a "wedding" garment, to accord with the parable of the wedding feast into which these verses have been dovetailed. The reference is to the garment "of glory" and "of life" which should "not grow old" and whose "glory" should not "pass away,"—the garment which could never be the clothing of any wicked individual.

Further, in this book the "many mansions" (John xiv. 2) are for the first time brought into prominence in Jewish literature. "And there I saw another vision, the dwelling places of the holy, and the resting places of the righteous" (xxxix. 3). "And there I saw the mansions of the elect and the mansions of the holy" (xli. 2). "And their places of rest shall be innumerable" (xlv. 3). "With him (i.e. the Son of Man) will be their dwelling-places, and with him their heritage, and they shall not be separated from him for ever and ever and ever" (lxxi. 16).

The prodigality of Manasses and his prayer as a penitent seem to have been favourite subjects with the devout. The words which are put into the mouth of the taxgatherer in the parable of Jesus seem to reveal the influence of the small popular tract, the *Prayer of Manasses* (date uncertain). "Thou therefore, O Lord," says Manasses, "that art the God of the righteous, hast not appointed repentance unto the righteous, unto Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, who have not sinned against Thee; but Thou hast appointed repentance unto me a sinner" (ver. 8); and similarly the taxgatherer

prays, "God be merciful to me a sinner" (Luke xviii. 13). The former goes on to say, "And I am not worthy to behold and see the height of heaven by reason of the multitude of mine iniquities" (ver. 9), and the latter is introduced as an individual who "would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven" (ver. 13). The pharisee's prayer, "God, I thank Thee, that I am not as the rest of men" (ver. 11), gains point, if Manasses' reference to the patriarchs "who have not sinned" and who are therefore "the righteous" to whom God has "not appointed repentance," is kept in mind. Jesus seems to be contradicting the supposition of "certain who trusteth in themselves that they were righteous and set all others at nought" (ver. 9), who assumed that they were not in the class to whom God had "appointed repentance . . . that they may be saved" (P. Man. ver. 7).

His contact with the *Psalms of Solomon* (about 50 B.C.) may be illustrated by the fact that on one occasion his mind, as he spoke, seems to have been travelling through the fifth of them. The psalmist says to God, "Man and his portion (lie) before Thee in the balance; he cannot add to, so as to enlarge, what has been prescribed by Thee" (ver. 6); and so, more specifically, Jesus asks, "And which of you by being anxious can add one cubit unto his stature (or 'age')"? (Matt. vi. 27 || Luke xii. 25). "Birds and fish dost Thou nourish" (ver. 11), says the psalmist; and so also Jesus, dropping out the fish,—appropriately, may be, in view of his having fishermen among his disciples,—exclaims, "Behold the birds of the heaven . . . your heavenly Father nourisheth them" (ver. 26 || Luke xii. 24).

“Thou givest rain to the steppes that green grass may spring up” (ver. 11) goes on the psalmist; and so, too, Jesus passes on to the same illustration, “Consider the wildflowers of the land, how they grow; . . . God doth so clothe the grass of the field” (vers. 28, 30 || Luke xii. 27 f.). The confidence of the psalmist is that, “he whose hope is (set) on Thee shall have no lack of gifts” (ver. 16); that of Jesus that “Your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things” (ver. 32 || Luke xii. 30). The climax of the psalm is—after a remark that “man’s goodness is bestowed grudgingly, and the morrow (? is always in view)” (ver. 15)—“Happy is he whom God remembereth in (granting to him) a due sufficiency. . . . SuffICIENT are moderate means with righteousness. . . . Thy goodness is upon Israel in Thy kingdom” (vers. 18, 20 f.); and with similar thoughts and in similar terms Jesus winds up, “seek ye first his kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added to you” (ver. 33 || Luke xii. 31). “Be not therefore anxious for the morrow; for the morrow will be anxious over its own sufficiency. To the day (be) its evil” (ver. 34). Jesus’ aside on “Solomon in all his glory” (ver. 29 || Luke xii. 27) may even have been due to his recognition that his mind, as he was speaking, was following an outline which had been supplied for him by a so-called psalm of Solomon.

In the *Zadokite Fragments* (18 B.C.—A.D. 70), or more probably 18–8 B.C.) the writer in his criticism of those who “are caught in fornication in taking two wives during their lifetime” remarks, “But the fundamental principle of the creation is

'Male and Female created He them' " (vii. 1 f.). This very principle was laid down by Jesus in identical terms, when in reference to Moses' permission "to write a bill of divorcement and to put her away," he said, "For your hardness of heart he wrote you this commandment. But from the beginning of the creation, 'Male and Female made He them' " (Mark x. 4-6 || Matt. xix. 7 f.). On another occasion Jesus deliberately took sides with the Pharisees against such extreme rigourists as these fragments represent. The strict laws of the Sabbath which are set out in chapter xiii of this work may have been known to his audience. In reference to a misfortune to an animal, it is said here, "And if it falls into a pit or ditch, he shall not raise it on the Sabbath" (ver. 24). Jesus assumed that many would not be prepared to conform to this law, when he asked concerning a sheep, "If this fall into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold of it and lift it out?" (Matt. xii. 11 || Luke xiv. 5). No reply was made to his question, and he proceeded therefore to argue on the assumption that silence gave consent. The statement that "they could not answer again" (Luke xiv. 6) to the arguments which he advanced may, then, refer to the embarrassment to them which arose from the fact that he purposely argued from his agreement with them on a point on which they were opposed to the views of the Zadokites.

The members of the party, whose views appear in these fragments, seem to have very loudly professed loyalty to "the New Covenant" (viii. 15, ix. 28B, 37), which is described as "the covenant of repentance" (ix. 15B). This was probably a

further definition of what Jeremiah meant by "a new covenant" (xxx. 31). Jesus, too, spoke of "the New Covenant" (Luke xxii. 20 || Mark xiv. 24, Matt. xxvi. 28, cf. 1 Cor. xi. 25), and he, too, began his public preaching with, "Repent ye" (Mark i. 15 || Matt. iv. 7). Further, as these New Covenanters thought of themselves in antithesis to "the children of the world" (ix. 54), so also Jesus was in the habit of contrasting with his own true disciples "the children of this world" (Luke xvi. 8, xx. 34). We should perhaps recognise a conscious elevation of the ideas of the New Covenanters, when he set forth the necessity of sacrificial service, his own and others, in order to the establishment of this much-desired New Covenant of Repentance. John the Baptist may have been the mouthpiece of these New Covenanters within Palestine.

In the *Martyrdom of Isaiah* (date uncertain) the story is told of Isaiah that "to the prophets who were with him he said before he had been sawn in sunder: Go ye to the region of Tyre and Sidon: for for me only hath God mingled the cup" (v. 13). Jesus' own retreat "into the borders of Tyre and Sidon" (Mark vii. 24 || Matt. xv. 21) may have brought this book to his mind, and especially its closing and very emphatic reference to martyrdom as "the cup." When he came out of retreat again, it was with the consciousness that "the cup" had been mingled for him: "Are ye able to drink the cup that I drink?" (Mark x. 38 || Matt. xx. 22), "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me. . . . O my Father, if this cannot pass away, except I drink it, Thy will be done" (Matt. xxvi. 39, 42 || Mark xiv. 36, Luke xxii. 42),

"the cup, which the Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?" (John xviii. 11). Besides, this same cup of martyrdom which had come to him in the fulfilment of his great prophetic office, he hinted—in distinction from and in possible reminiscence of the case of Isaiah—was very probably in due course to be mingled for more than himself. "The cup that I drink ye shall drink" (Mark x. 39 || Matt. xx. 23), "Drink of it all of you" (Matt. xxvi. 27 || Mark xiv. 23, Luke xxii. 17).

The reference in the *Assumption of Moses* (A.D. 7-30) to those "who shall be also in bondage for seventy and seven years" (iii. 14) throws an interesting light on Jesus' use of the phrase "until seventy seven times" (Matt. xviii. 22 || Luke xvii. 4). In such an association the number would suggest the meaning, "until the end of the present age," that is, until the time came, when, with the opening of the new age, people would be so perfect that, presumably, there would be no longer a call on one's readiness to forgive. The following also should be noted: "My Lord, thou art departing and who shall feed this people? . . . who shall be their guide by the way? Or, who shall pray for them? . . . How therefore am I to foster this people as a father . . . they have no advocate (*defensor*) to offer prayers on their behalf to the Lord, like Moses the great messenger" (xi. 9-12, 17). With these words the words of Jesus should be compared: "And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another advocate (*paracletum*) that he may be with you for ever. . . . I will not leave you orphans" (John xiv. 16, 18). The way in which the Fourth Evangelist, both in his

own comments and in his version of the words of Jesus and of others (see i. 17, iii. 14, v. 45 f., ix. 29), contrasts Moses and Jesus, favours the association which we discern here. The reference in the words of Jesus to "advocate," and that also to not leaving them "orphans"—that is, without a father's care—make more than likely that there is here a reminiscence of the passage just quoted, in which Moses is the mediator of God's covenant prepared before the foundation of the world (i. 14), and appointed to be after his death Israel's intercessor in the spiritual world (xii. 6). This would make the phrase "another advocate" to mean that not only was Jesus going to be in relation to them hereafter as Moses was in this book represented to be to Israel after his death, but also they would have "another" who would always be with them; hence, they would be really better off than under Moses—they would still have here in this life an inspiring Presence.

In regard to the *Second Book of Enoch* (A.D. 1-50) and the teaching of Jesus there are some things which should be noted, whatever be the relation of the latter to the former. The remarkable similarity between the following on the necessity for the absolute reliability of one's ungarnished statements, and the words of Jesus on the same subject is not without significance: "I swear to you, my children, but I swear not by any oath, neither by heaven, nor by earth, nor by any other creature which God created. The Lord said, There is no oath in me, nor injustice, but truth. If there is no truth in man, let them swear by the words 'yea, yea,' or else 'nay, nay'" (xlix. 1).

Jesus' injunction was, "Swear not at all; neither by the heaven, . . . nor by the earth, . . . nor by Jerusalem. . . . Neither . . . by thy head. . . . But let your speech be, Yea, Yea; Nay, nay" (Matt. v. 34-37). The following also should be noted: "in his heart there is no peace, but a sword" (lii. 14), and compared with, "I came not to send peace, but a sword" (Matt. x. 34 || Luke xii. 51). Moreover, there is in common between them an outspoken rejection of the Zealot attitude: Enoch writes here, "Endure for the sake of the Lord every wound, every injury, every evil word and attack. If ill-requitals befall you, return them not either to neighbour or enemy"; and so, too, Jesus exhorts, "Resist not him that is evil; but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also" (Matt. v. 39). In this book, too, are to be found the fullest descriptions of "the very great, open, and weeping hell," where "the prisoners are in pain, expecting the limitless judgment" (xl. 12, cf. vii. 1-3), which is referred to in the words, "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. viii. 12, cf. xiii. 42, xxii. 13, xxv. 30).

Similarly, it may be possible some day to prove that most of the quotations from and references to the Old Testament in the recorded teaching of Jesus are from passages which were regularly used as lessons in the services of the synagogues; that in our Gospels there are references to the contents of a then existing Jewish Prayer Book; and that Jesus was acquainted with material which has now been gathered into the Rabbinical literature.

INDEX

Almsgiving, 48, 84

Angels—

significance of, 27

legends of wicked, 38 f

punishment of wicked, 57

Assumption of Moses, reminiscences of the, 120 f

Atonement, 47, 48, 69 f

Books—

knowledge of, 13 f

private possession of, 14 f

a circle's possession of, 15

a synagogue's possession of, 16

Ceremonialism, love to God in, 44 f. Cf. humanitarianism

Circumcision, the rite of, 43.

Cf. Proselytism

Clean—

the Unclean and the, 43 f

Jesus' new idea of, 76 f

Cf. Taxgatherers and sinners

Covenanters, New, 64, cf. 118 f

Darkness, place of, 52 f, 89

Death, significance of, 55, 93 ff.

See also Gehenna

Deism, absence of, 26

Enoch—

reminiscences of the *First Book of*, 111-115

Enoch—

reminiscences of the *Second Book of*, 121 f.

Faith in God, 50, 64 f, 84 f.

Cf. Suffering

Fasting, 48, cf. 108

Father in heaven—

synagogue use of, 23

Jesus' use of, 59 ff

Final Doom. See Wicked

Fire, the place of. See Gehenna

Future Life, the, 50 f. See also Gehenna, Paradise, etc.

Gehenna—

the idea of, 56 f

Jesus and the idea of, 88, 95 f

Gentiles, admission of the, 29 f. Cf. Proselytism

Grace of God, the, 47, 82 f

Holiness, 41. See also Clean, Ceremonialism

Humanitarianism, the love to God in, 78 f. Cf. Ceremonialism

Inclination. See Yetzer

Inwardness—

Judaistic idea of, 40, 42, 48 f

Jesus' new kind of, 74

Jubilees, reminiscences of, 106 f

Judgment, the, 89 f
 new standard at the, 90 f
 the Fatherhood of God and
 the, 93 ff

Justice of God—
 ordinary idea of the, 24 f
 Jesus' idea of the, 86 ff

Kingdom of God—
 ideas of the, 28 ff
 woes of the, 34, 68
 growth of, 63
 Cf. Gentiles, Judgment,
 Resurrection

Law, the. *See* Torah

Love of God, the, 25 f. *See*
 also Father in heaven

Maccabees, II and IV, reminis-
 cences of, 104 ff

Man—
 idea of, 36 f
 image of God in, 37 f
 light of conscience in, 38
 legends of first, 39

Martyrdom, the duty of, 63,
 67 ff

Martyrdom of Isaiah, reminis-
 cences of the, 119 f

Mercy of God, the, 49 f 85

Merit, new idea of, 83-86. Cf.
 Works

Messiah—
 idea of, 31 f
 human, 32 f
 work of human, 33 f
 object of human, 35
 work of superhuman, 35 f

Missionary obligation—
 Judaism and, 29 f
 Jesus and, 62 ff, 91

Old Testament—
 idea of an, 16 f

Old Testament—
 inability to possess a com-
 plete, 18.

Originality, Jesus', 22, 57 f, 97

Paradise—
 intermediate, 51 f, 88, 92
 final, 53 f, 94

Pharisaism, the deficiency of
 the best, 72 f

Prayer, importance of, 27 f,
 48, 82

Prayer of Manasses, reminis-
 cences of the, 115 f

Prophet, Jesus as, 65

Proselytism, rejection of, 75 f.
 Cf. Circumcision, Gentiles
Psalms of Solomon, reminis-
 cences of the, 116 f

Repentance—
 need for, 30 f, 46 f, 48
 deeper kind of, 62, 64, 81
 Resurrection, doctrines of, 53 ff,
 91 f

Righteousness—
 Messiah's, 32
 the idea of, 41 f
 Jesus' pre-eminence in, 66 f
 Jesus' addition to the idea
 of, 71 ff, cf. 90 f

Sabbath—
 the observance of the, 42 f
 Jesus' attitude to the obser-
 vance of the, 77 f, 83

Schools, Jewish, 19 f

Sheol, divisions in, 50 f, 88 f.
See also Darkness, Paradise

Sin—
 the idea of, 45 f
 removal of, 46
 Jesus' idea of, 80 f

Swach, reminiscences of,
 99-103

Son of God, Jesus as, 64 f, 69,
82. Cf. Wisdom of God
Spirit, holy, 82 f. Cf. Wisdom
of God
Suffering—
Judaism and the problem
of, 24 f
Jesus and the problem of,
87 f
Synagogue—
books at a, 18 f
private reading at a, 20
Jesus' reading at Capernaum,
16, 20
Jesus' acceptance at the, 22
encouragement of prayer by
the, 27 f
Taxgatherers and sinners, 72 f.
Cf. Clean
Temple, Jesus and the, 61 f, 84
Testaments of Twelve Patriarchs,
reminiscences of the, 107-110.
Tobit, reminiscences of, 103 f
Torah, the, 40 f
Jesus' freedom in respect to
the, 70

Torah—
Jesus' departure from the,
71 f, 84
See also Clean, Sabbath,
Wisdom, etc.
Unclean. *See* Clean
Virtues, new range of, 73 f
War—
the need for, 33 f
no place for, 69 f
Wicked, the Fatherhood of
God and the final doom
of the, 92-95
Wisdom of God, the, 27, 47
Jesus and the, 65 f.
Cf. Spirit
Works, the doctrine of, 49 f.
Cf. Merit
Yetzer, the doctrine of the,
39 f, cf. 82
Zadokite Fragments, reminiscences
of the, 117 f



GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD.

LONDON: 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C.1

CAPE TOWN. 73 ST. GEORGE'S STREET

SYDNEY, N.S.W.: 46 CARRINGTON STREET

WELLINGTON, N.Z.: 4 WILLIS STREET

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



134 534

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY